DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 948 PS 009 625

TITLE	Developmental Assessment Instruments: Survey and Identification of Head Start Practices and Needs. Interim Report.
INSTITUTION	International Training Consultants, Inc., Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	Child Development Services Bureau (DHEW/OCD), Washington, D.C. Project Head Start.
PUB DATE	31 Jul 77
CONTRACT	HEW-105-76-1134
NOTE	130p.; For appendix to this report, see PS 009 626
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Bilingual Students; Classroom Observation Techniques; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Accountability; Educational Legislation; Evaluation; Historical Reviews; Legal Problems; *Measurement Instruments; *Measurement Techniques; National Surveys; *Needs Assessment; Staff Improvement; *Teacher Attitudes; Testing
IDENTIFIERS	Classroom Developmental Assessment; *Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This interim report presents the background, procedures, and preliminary results of a national survey of Head Start directors and teachers, focusing on the extent of use of developmental assessment procedures and instruments, staff perceptions of their usefulness and of unmet needs, and the relationship of selected variables to the use of assessment procedures and instruments. A review of related literature presents information on the history of Head Start, current legislation, educational accountability, legal trends, issues in testing, and training. Data on developmental assessment practices were collected on two questionnaires sent to 1900 Head Start directors and 1900 Head Start teachers. Results presented here reflect data from 773 teachers and 657 directors from center-based programs. Statistics describing the structural characteristics of the programs, training and experience of teachers, and language and ethnic/racial composition of classes are provided. Other data reported indicate that assessment procedures and instruments are widely used, that observation is regarded as the most useful procedure, and that at least 35% of instruments used are locally developed. Additional findings and an extensive bibliography are included. Appendix is available separately through ERIC. (Author/JMB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED145948

DEVELOPMENTAL ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS: SURVEY AND IDENTIFICATION OF HEAD START PRACTICES AND NEEDS

I N T E R I M R E P O R T

July 31, 1977

Project Director:	Michael H. Annison	
Senior Staff:	Arna Caplan	Oralie McAfee
	Kathryn Conover	Fern Portnoy
Administrative Assistant:	Deborah Roberti	
Research Staff:	Ruth Hawkins	Marcia May
	Kris Hefley	Marilyn Weiksner

PS 009625

Prepared for

Project Head Start
Office of Child Development
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Under HEW Contract No. 105-76-1134
Joseph Lapides, Project Officer

International Training Consultants, Inc.
838 Grant Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jerry Lapides

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Any national study depends upon the cooperation and support of many people beyond the research staff. We wish to acknowledge the help given us by the national Office of Child Development, the Resource Access Projects, the Review Panel for the study, special groups from whom we sought information and guidance, and people in the Head Start programs in the Denver area who pilot-tested the questionnaires and kept us reminded of the realities of life in classrooms.

Special thanks go to the Head Start directors and teachers throughout the country, who took the time to fill out and return yet another form. Many of them called, wrote letters, or wrote explanatory, encouraging, or despairing comments on the questionnaires. One group of teachers compiled a humorous questionnaire for us to fill out. Staff began to feel a special relationship with the programs -- including the director of a program in a small town in Arkansas who called in July to say that the questionnaires had just arrived in the mail and could she still send them in. Even the mailman took a personal interest in the number returned each day.

We appreciate the interest and goodwill of all of the people and organizations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Questions of the study	2
	Assumption	4
	Limitations on the study	6
	Data collection	6
	Definition of terms used in the study	8
II.	CONTEXT OF THE STUDY	10
	Educational accountability	16
	Legal issues	18
	Issues in testing	21
	Training	25
III.	METHODS AND PROCEDURES	29
	Field Study	31
	Questionnaire development	33
	Coding procedures	38
	The coding manual	38
	Final coding procedures	39
	Instrument coding	40
	Literature review	40
	Procedures of the literature	41
	Data bases and sources	42

CHAPTER PAGE

Instrument review. 43

Criteria for instrument selection . . . 45

Quality control procedures. 46

Work plan 47

Professional publications 48

Discussions with professionals. 49

Consultant assistance. 50

Review panel. 50

Practitioner review 54

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION 56

Who are the respondents?. 57

Where are the programs that responded located?. 57

What are the structural characteristics of the program operation and the classrooms? 60

What training and teaching-related experience do Head Start teachers have? 64

What is the language and ethnic/racial composition of Head Start classes?. . 68

What do directors report about the assessment procedures teachers in their program use?. 71

CHAPTER PAGE

What assessment procedures do teachers report they use? 74

Do directors and teachers think the assessment instruments they know about or use are appropriate to the culture and language of the children in the program?. 78

What assessment instruments do teachers use? 79

What is assessed? 80

What are the patterns of use of the individual assessment instruments?. . 83

What are teacher perceptions of the utility of assessment instruments?. . 86

Are there developmental areas that are particularly important to assess? . . 86

Is there a perceived need for additional assessment instruments?. . 86

What role do parents play in the assessment process? 91

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 95

APPENDIX

A. Literature review: State of the Art, April 30, 1977

B. Issues in testing, assessment and evaluation

APPENDIX

C. Classroom developmental assessment - The link between testing and teaching

D. Ways of assessing young children

E. Review of previous studies of assessment practices

F. Teacher and director questionnaires

G. Coding procedures

H. Literature review form D

I. Procedures manual: Review of assessment instruments

J. Review of locally developed instruments

K. List of instruments reviewed

L. Technical Appendix

M. Agenda materials, Review Panel Meeting, February 6, 7, & 8, 1977

N. Agenda materials, Review Panel Meeting, May 26 and 27, 1977

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Breakdown of Questionnaire Returns	58
2.	Distribution by Population of Program Operation	59
3.	Size of Program Operation: Number of Teachers Per Program	61
4.	Size of Program Operation: Number of Children Per Program	62
5.	Characteristics of Head Start Classrooms . . .	63
6.	Teacher Training in Teaching Young Children. .	65
7.	Teacher Training in Using Assessment Instruments	66
8.	Teaching Experience of Head Start Teachers . .	67
9.	Language Background of Head Start Classrooms .	69
10.	Ethnic and Racial Composition of Head Start Classrooms	70
11.	Directors' Report: Assessment Procedures Teachers Use.	72
12.	Directors' Report: Most Useful Methods for Learning About What A Child Knows and Can Do	73

TABLE PAGE

13. Directors' Report: How Information From Assessment Procedures and Instruments Helps Teachers Plan 75

14. Teachers' Report: Methods of Keeping Track of Child's Progress 76

15. Teachers' Report: Assessment Method Most Helpful in Planning for Individual Children . 77

16. Most Frequently Used Assessment Instruments . . 81

17. Frequency and Pattern of Use of Assessment Instruments 84

18. Time Required For Administration of Assessment Instruments 85

19. Ways Information From Individual Assessment Instruments Is Used By Teachers 87

20. Most Important Use of Information From Individual Assessment Instruments 88

21. Directors' Report: Areas of Development Important to Assess 89

22. Parental Involvement In Locally Developed Assessment Instruments. 94

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES PAGE

1. Selected events related to Head Start and Assessment Practices 11a

2. Head Start Regions 30

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

On October 1, 1976, International Training Consultants, Inc. (ITC) was awarded a contract, "Developmental Assessment Instruments: Survey and Identification of Head Start Practices and Needs, " by the Office of Child Development. The contract requires that ITC

1. Determine the present status of Head Start classroom developmental assessment practices as they relate to the goal of individualization for each child;

2. Make recommendations to staff of the Office of Child Development to assist their planning relative to enhancing the ability of Head Start classroom staff to use developmental assessment procedures in individualizing programs for children. This includes:

   - Identifying developmental areas for which assessment instruments are currently unavailable or inadequate;

   - Making recommendations relative to issues which have a bearing on the use of developmental assessment practices and individualization.

The contract requires a final report on or before March 13, 1978 and an interim report on July 31, 1977. This interim report is the documentation of findings to date.

The contract requires an analysis that explicitly considers classroom developmental assessment practices and related issues, such as teacher training and the adequacy of the existing pool of assessment instruments. The study will produce findings and conclusions documenting actual classroom practices. The recommendations will be designed to assist OCD in planning to help teachers individualize programs.

Questions of the Study

This investigation seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the extent of use of developmental assessment procedures and instruments by Head Start teachers?
   a. What assessment procedures and instruments do teachers actually use?
   b. With what frequency are these procedures and instruments used?
   c. What developmental areas are most frequently assessed?
   d. Which instruments were formerly used but are now discontinued?
   e. Why did teachers who formerly used instruments as part of the assessment process discontinue their use?
2. What are director/education coordinator and teacher perceptions of the usefulness of developmental assessment procedures and instruments and their relationship to classroom program planning?
   a. Which procedures and instruments do teachers and directors think are most helpful in assessing children's development and progress?
   b. Which procedures and instruments do teachers and directors think are most helpful in planning for children's activities?
   c. Do teachers think the assessment instruments they know about or use are appropriate to the culture and language of children they teach?
   d. How do teachers use the information from assessment instruments?
   e. Why do teachers who do not use assessment instruments choose not to?

3. What do directors/education coordinators and teachers identify as unmet needs in developmental assessment procedures and instruments?

   a. In what areas, if any, are additional assessment instruments needed?

   b. If additional instruments are needed, how should they be developed?

4. What is the relationship of selected variables, both internal and external to Head Start, to the use of assessment procedures and instruments?

   a. What is the relationship of selected center and classroom structural variables to assessment practices?

      1) Center or home-based program
      2) Number of classes each teacher teaches
      3) Number of children in each class
      4) Average number of assisting adults in each class
      5) Administrative requirements concerning assessment practices
      6) Institutional affiliation of Head Start agency -- public school, local government, community action agency, private
      7) Size of agency
      8) Nature of program area served
      9) Proximity of research and training resources

   b. What is the relationship of selected background variables of children to assessment practices?

      1) English as first or second language
      2) Racial or ethnic group membership

   c. What is the relationship of selected training and experience background variables of teachers to assessment practices?

      1) Number of years teaching
      2) Number of years teaching in Head Start
      3) Prior experience as Head Start aide or parent
      4) Specific training in teaching young children
      5) Specific training in using assessment instruments

d. What is the relationship of the characteristics of selected assessment instruments and their use in Head Start?

   1) Length of administration time
   2) Assistance required for administration or interpretation
   3) Developmental area assessed
   4) Use of results of assessment instruments

e. What is the relationship of selected social and legislative trends in the use of assessment instruments in Head Start?

   1) In what ways have legislative mandates affected the use of instruments?
   2) In what ways have judicial decisons affected the use of instruments?

f. What role do parents play in the assessment process?

These questions form the central focus of the investigation.

Assumption

The underlying assumption of the study is that developmental assessment procedures and instruments are appropriate for use in the Head Start setting. This study is predicated on the concept of developmental assessment as a process that enables the teacher to learn about and plan activities for individual children. As such, it is a broader process than "testing," and includes such procedures as systematic observation, child and parent interviews, and analysis of children's work, as well as integrating and using the information.

At the present time, the fields of evaluation and testing are in a state of flux. Serious and thought-provoking questions

are being raised about the purposes of testing and evaluation, the appropriate uses of evaluative information, the functions of summative and formative evaluation, the relative merits of criterion referencing and norm-referencing and the social implications of testing and evaluation. Generally, however, few educators would argue with the idea that some understanding of a child's current level of functioning and the means to determine changes over time are requirements for sound educational planning.

With an increasing emphasis on individualization of programs for young children in Head Start, the need for developmental assessment becomes even more apparent. Also, continuity of the educational experience for the young child is enhanced if there is a continual and appropriate assessment of the child's development and if linkages are established to share this information as the child progresses through the educational system.

The past decade has witnessed a press for equal educational opportunity. A responsive social climate and state and federal legislation have mandated that public schools provide educational experiences to all children regardless of race, sex, language, physical or mental disability, or any other characteristic. Adjustments in educational programs and procedures, including those in Head Start, have been necessary in order to recognize these individual differences and their implications for teaching.

Limitations on the Study

The investigation has limitations that may affect the generalizability of some of the results. Data collection is limited to Head Start programs and does not consider the variety of developmental assessment practices which may actually be used or are potentially appropriate for use in other early childhood education programs and settings.

The investigation is limited to developmental assessment procedures and instruments appropriate for pre-primary children, particularly those children from ages three (3) to five (5). The age restriction conforms with the age of children attending Head Start programs and avoids inclusion of instruments designed specifically for infants or instruments to assess the achievement and academic readiness of children above the age of five.

The investigation is further limited to procedures and instruments that teachers and classroom personnel use and that result in information useful for planning educational programs to meet the needs of individual children. Thus, the educational component of Head Start has been the focus of the study. Instruments designed to be used by specialists, such as physicians, psychologists, and speech therapists, are not considered.

Data Collection

The data to analyze these issues and respond to the questions identified are being collected through four methods. These are a field study, an instrument review, consultant assistance, and a

review of the literature. Each of these is discussed below.

1. Field Study. Questionnaires and site visits will be used to collect data on current developmental assessment practices in Head Start classrooms. The field study also makes it possible to gather information on variables such as teacher training and administrative structure which may be related to developmental assessment practices.

   a. Questionnaire A -- This questionnaire was mailed to 1,973 Head Start program operators for completion by the Head Start Director or Education Coordinator. Data have been collected and the results are reported in Chapter IV of this report. The questionnaire collected the following types of information:

      (1) general program and demographic data

      (2) specific information on assessment procedures and instruments and their relationship to program planning

   b. Questionnaire B -- This questionnaire was mailed to 1,973 Head Start program operators for completion by one classroom teacher per site. Data have been collected and the results reported in Chapter IV of this report. The questionnaire collected the following types of information:

      (1) general information on classroom structure and teacher training and experience

      (2) specific information relating to assessment procedures and instruments, particularly as they apply to classroom use and teacher perceptions of utility in assessing children's development and planning programs

   c. Site Visits -- Site visits by trained staff will be made between October 15, 1977, and January 15, 1978. The visits will validate data from the questionnaires and collect additional data from Head Start administrators, parents, teachers and professional staff.

2. Instrument Review. Thirteen (13) developmental assessment instruments have been reviewed by project staff. Each of these instruments have met three or more of the following criteria:

   - Instruments which are appropriate for use with three to five year olds
   - Instruments which are published
   - Instruments which require a minimum amount of training for effective teacher utilization
   - Instruments which require minimal time to administer
   - Instruments for which technical data are available

3. Consultant Assistance. A Review Panel of noted experts in the fields of evaluation, early childhood education, and developmental assessment have participated with project staff and the Office of Child Development in meeting the objectives of this study. The panel met on February 6, 7, and 8, 1977, in Denver, Colorado and May 26 and 27, 1977, in El Paso, Texas. In addition, members of the panel have been contributing in their area of expertise as required. The staff has also discussed issues related to developmental assessment with representatives of professional organizations and other recognized experts to ensure that the widest possible range of views is considered and incorporated.

4. Review of the Literature. Project staff has completed a selected review of the literature in the following content areas: developmental assessment, evaluation, history and context of Head Start, teacher training and individualization.

Definition of Terms Used in the Study

Basic terms in the study are used with the following meanings

1. Developmental Assessment is a way of describing a child's place in the sequence of development and the process of learning, in terms of what a child knows and can do, so that instructional programs can be planned and implemented that foster his/her continued development.

2. Developmental Assessment Instruments are staff or commercially developed guides for observing and recording a child's behavior, and in some cases, developmental history. The initial use of a developmental assessment instrument provides a baseline from which to plan for the child and against which to evaluate the child's progress over time.

3. Assessment Instruments are forms, schedules, profiles, rating sheets, tests, guides or charts for systematically collecting and recording certain information used in the assessment process.

4. Assessment Procedures are methods and techniques used in the assessment process, such as formal and informal observation, interviews, and collection and analysis of children's work products.

5. *Individualization in the context of Head Start, refers to program strategies which enable each child to receive the education, health and nutrition services he/she needs. Classroom staff may organize individual, small group, and/or large group activities to meet assessed needs of children. Individualization does not mean children spend most of their time interacting with adults or materials in isolation from other children.

6. *Head Start Performance Standards are program standards promulgated by the Office of Child Development which constitute the basic requirements that must be met by local Head Start grantees as a condition of federal funding.

7. *Social Competence in the context of Head Start means the child's everyday effectiveness in dealing with both present environment and later responsibilities in school and life. Social competence takes into account the interrelatedness of cognitive and intellectual development, physical and mental health, and nutritional needs that constitute a developmental approach to helping children achieve competence.

*These definitions are from the Request for Proposal, 105-76-1134, Office of Child Development, 1976.

CHAPTER II

CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Few investigations of the current status of a given phenomenon can be carried out without a knowledge and understanding of the historical and social context of the problem. This is true particularly of important aspects of federal programs for young children. These programs are established and operate within a complex and shifting framework of theoretical research, applied research, legislation, appropriations, related programs, evaluations, a general public policy "climate" and other forces. These forces interact with any individual program in ways that are seldom clear and simple; rather, the program operates within a layered web of interrelationships.

Some factors such as enabling or directive legislation, relate directly to program operation while others, such as theoretical research in child development are more indirect and subtle -- and frequently implicit rather than explicit.

Some of these forces are amenable to change from within a program. For example, the training of program staff can be focused on a particular topic, or research and demonstration projects can investigate the feasibility of a particular approach. Others are less amenable to direct influence.

Developmental assessment practices and individualization in Head Start, while seemingly a classroom or center matter, are also subject to and a part of this broader set of forces that must be considered in

identifying present practices and particularly future needs. A narrow approach runs the dangers of "using present rhetoric to understand the present" (White, 1973, Vol. I, p. 12) and using one-dimensional questions to attack a multi-dimensional problem.

To avoid this danger, a broad context for the study was conceptualized, laying out issues and questions that knowledge and experience indicated might be related. These were discussed in Chapter I and are documented in the Literature Outline (Appendix A). As the study progressed, certain topics and issues emerged as more relevant and worthwhile for in-depth study and review. Working papers on these -- "Issues in Testing, Assessment, and Evaluation," "Classroom Developmental Assessment: The Link Between Testing and Teaching," "Ways of Assessing Young Children," and "Review of Previous Studies of Assessment Practices" are presented in draft form in the Appendices (B - E).

The remainder of this chapter presents a chart (Figure 1) of relevant events related to the present study, followed by a narrative summary of the context of the study.

Project Head Start is generally viewed as a compensatory education program for children from three to six years. Historical examination, however, shows that Head Start was established to accomplish a multiplicity of goals:

FIGURE 1

SELECTED EVENTS RELATED TO HEAD START AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

WITHIN HEAD START	OTHER PROGRAMS	LEGISLATION OTHER THAN HEAD START	COURT DECISIONS
1964			
Economic Opportunity Act signed, Office of Economic Opportunity established; Project Head Start planning underway.	Community Action Programs, War on Poverty	Sec. 601 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination in any program or activity receiving federal aid on the basis of race, color, or national origin.	History of court decisions requiring equal educational opportunity - Brown vs. Board of Education (1954)
1965			
Head Start summer programs began		Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) -- Mandated evaluation procedures were inserted. Particularly relevant were Title I, IV, VI, and VII.	
1967			
Nine-month Head Start programs authorized and begun Head Start Manual of Policies and Instructions published.	Follow Through, U.S. Office of Education's program to extend benefits and gains of Head Start into the primary grades, was begun.		

Continued

FIGURE 1 (continued)

SELECTED EVENTS RELATED TO HEAD START AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

WITHIN HEAD START	OTHER PROGRAMS	LEGISLATION OTHER THAN HEAD START	COURT DECISIONS
1967			
	Eight Research & Development Centers established under the Cooperative Research Program of USOE. First twelve educational laboratories established		
1968			
Career Development Component mandated	"Model" sponsors begun in Follow Through	Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act authorized Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) to develop and operate model preschool projects for handicapped children.	

Continued

FIGURE 1 (continued)

SELECTED EVENTS RELATED TO HEAD START AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

WITHIN HEAD START	OTHER PROGRAMS	LEGISLATION OTHER THAN HEAD START	COURT DECISIONS
1969			
Head Start moved from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Office of Child Development established.	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped began "First Chance Network" (Handicapped Children's Early Education Programs)		Hobson vs. Hansen - Tests used for grouping were culture-biased.
Head Start Planned Variation begun.			
1970			Diana vs. Board of Education, Cultural bias claimed in IQ tests used for placing studemts in EMR classes.
1971			
	Technical Assistance Development System (TADS) established by BEH.		

Continued

FIGURE 1 (continued)

SELECTED EVENTS RELATED TO HEAD START AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

WITHIN HEAD START	OTHER PROGRAMS	LEGISLATION OTHER THAN HEAD START	COURT DECISIONS
1972			
Child Development Associate Consortium Congressional mandate to have 10% of Head Start enrollment be handicapped children Home Start	(1972, 1973 & ongoing), BEH Exemplary Early Childhood Projects begin "Outreach" phase, (after 3 years of development).	All states operating a Medicaid program required to provide EPSDT at least for children under six.	Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children vs. Pennsylvania & Mills vs. Board of Education. In both cases Court decided that mentally retarded children cannot be denied a public education. P vs. Riles. Cultural bias charged in IQ tests used to place blacks in EMR classes.
1973			
Early Childhood Collaborative Projects with Bureau of Education for the Handicapped Revised Performance Standards published Bilingual/bicultural initiatives, Child and Family Resource Program First 12 CDA pilot projects funded	"EPDST" Early and Periodic Screening for Detection & Treatment for Medicaid recipients.	Bilingual Education Act (Fed.) Title VII	Lebanks vs. Spears -- Mentally Retarded children cannot be denied public education.

Continued

FIGURE 1 (continued)

SELECTED EVENTS RELATED TO HEAD START AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

WITHIN HEAD START	OTHER PROGRAMS	LEGISLATION OTHER THAN HEAD START	COURT DECISIONS
1974			
Project Developmental Continuity	BEH "Child Find" (originally under 93-380, amended by 94-142, 1976) -- identification of children with special needs.	Public Law 93-380 Federal Due Process Regulations requires parental inclusion in identifying, classifying, or placing handicapped children. Buckley Amendment. Family Privacy Act. Title XX	Lau vs. Nichols. 414 U.S. 563. Children who speak a language other than English must be educated in that language. Serna vs. Portales Municipal Schools. Based on Lau, the court found a violation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and a violation of equal protection,
1975			
Revised Performance Projects-assessment included			
1976			
Regional Access Projects established.		Public Law 94-142 Free, appropriate education be available to all handicapped children.	

1. Improve the child's physical health and physical abilities.

2. Help the emotional and social development of the child by encouraging self-confidence, spontaneity, curiosity and self-confidence.

3. Improve the child's mental processes and skills with particular attention to conceptual and verbal skills.

4. Establish patterns and expectations of success for the child which will create a climate of confidence for his future learning efforts.

5. Increase the child's capacity to relate positively to family members and others while at the same time strengthening the family's ability to relate positively to the child and his problems.

6. Develop in the child and his family a responsive attitude toward society, and foster constructive opportunities for society to work together with the poor in solving their problems.

7. Increase the sense of dignity and self-worth in the child and his family

(Grotberg, 1969).

Underlying Head Start's goals and significantly affecting its development was a commitment to social change via local grass roots community involvement in decision making. The community involvement orientation assumed that the persons best able to understand and provide program leadership are the parent consumers and other representatives of the local community. This focus on autonomy and encouragement of local program development has continued.

Implementation strategies within Head Start overall and individual programs have also been influenced by Head Start's commitment to

program development through evolution and innovation. Home Start, Planned Variation, and Project Development Continuity, are explicit examples of this commitment. Because of Head Start's evolving nature, the Head Start of today can not be judged solely by past practices. This is especially clear when examining the changes in attitude toward and use of developmental assessment.

Programs mounted in the early days of Head Start usually reflected the then prevailing notion that an appropriate Head Start program would resemble a traditional nursery school. The role model for a Head Start teacher also came from traditional nursery school. Systematic assessment of children as a basis for planning in the classroom program was notable for its absence. The attitude toward assessment at that time was summarized by Omwake (1968) who observed that teachers do not structure their studies and formalize their findings "because they are engaged in teaching, not research. Taking time out to record would reduce their effectiveness on the job" (p. 537-538).

Over time, characteristics and experiential background of Head Start staff have changed. More and more teachers have been trained specifically in early childhood education both within Head Start's Career Development Program and in other ways. With the decline in the school population, an increasing number of professionally trained teachers have turned to Head Start for employment opportunities. These teachers may bring different orientation expectations and experiences to the Head Start setting. The specific effects of these differences particularly with respect to assessment and individualization are not yet known.

Over the past ten years there has been increasing awareness of the necessity for evaluation at all levels of the educational system. For example, the increased competition for available public resources to support educational programs has brought with it a greater emphasis on program evaluation and accountability. Head Start has been affected by this trend. An early effort involving child testing and assessment in Head Start was the 1969 Head Start Planned Variation. Efforts to evaluate alternative models and to compare the relative effectiveness of different theoretical and practical approaches introduced systematic program evaluation to Head Start on a broad scale.

In 1969, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped began the "First Chance Network:" Handicapped Children's Early Education Program. Many of these projects approached the education of young handicapped children through direct teaching in school. They also developed means of assessing the developmental level of children as an initial step in this process. Many developmental assessment instruments in use in Head Start classrooms today were originally developed as part of the BEH projects, e.g., the Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP) and the Portage Guides.

In 1972, the Congress mandated that Head Start programs provide at least 10% of the national Head Start enrollment opportunities (later mandated to a 10% enrollment in each state) for handicapped children. The mandate resulted in part from social and legislative trends toward equal educational opportunity for the handicapped and in part from an awareness that young children could benefit

from having problems identified and treated while they were young. The mandate required an affirmative outreach and recruitment effort. Its intent was to provide for the special and individualized needs of the handicapped child in a mainstreamed environment and to work closely with other community agencies to identify and provide services.

The 1972 mandate brought both formal and informal collaboration between Head Start and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped demonstration projects. At the same time, BEH "Early Education" projects which had received three year-funding to develop assessment instruments and procedures were, in 1972, funded to disseminate their results. Many of these outreach efforts were directed toward Head Start.

In 1973, the Early and Periodic Screening Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) was implemented. This effort encouraged collaboration between Head Start and the USOE's "Child Find," a pre-kindergarten screening program for all children. Under Child Find, federal funds flow through State Departments of Education to individual school districts. Each district has the responsibility to locate, identify, and evaluate all handicapped children within its jurisdiction.

Efforts directed toward identification and individualization for handicapped children preceeded and interacted with a number of trends and factors both within and outside Head Start to lay the groundwork for the formal mandate directed at <u>all</u> Head Start children. This mandate was included in the Head Start Performance Standards of 1975.

The Standards require that the education service component "...shall provide procedures for ongoing observation, recording and evaluation of each child's growth and development for the purpose of planning activities to suit individual needs..." (p. 10).

Educational Accountability

Beginning in the 1960's an increasing number of questions were raised about the costs and effectiveness of the educational system. Declining enrollments at institutions of higher education and in urban school systems, combined with cost and budget increases, and concern for quality in education raised numerous questions which came to be grouped under the rubric of "accountability." According to Hawthorne (1974) there were many developments which were instrumental in focusing public attention on accountability in education. These included:

- Society's re-evaluation of its traditional goals.
- The initial results of the National Association of Educational Progress.
- The 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I with its focus on programs for the educationally and culturally deprived.
- The 1966 Coleman Report on Equality of Educational Opportunity.

Webster (1973) suggests three additional developments:

- By the 1960's there was no longer an issue of making school accessible to all children and the focus, therefore, moved to ensuring that the schools were educating responsibly.

- Massive federal involvement heightened the visibility of some educational programs and thus raised public expectations. This was especially true for those whose children had been subjected to public sub-standard schooling.
- The ambivalence of several major publicized evaluations (including the Westinghouse evaluation of Head Start Cicirelli, et al., 1969), of the impact of massive subsidization eroded the public's confidence in the idea that large infusions of tax dollars would result in substantial improvements in the measured performance of schooling.

Hawthorne (1974) suggests that the main thrust of the accountability movement is to enable every member of society to acquire the highest quality education possible and to show that an individual's learning is proportionate in measure to the available sources of supply and support assigned to the program.

The emphasis on the need to measure the outcomes of the educational process are the crux of the movement toward accountability and serve to focus attention on quantitative measurement and testing while at the same time implicitly accepting the assumption that every child can learn if the right conditions prevail.

Not all educators agree with the current focus of the accountability movement. The very nature of the demand for measureable educational outcomes can tend to shape and restrict the educational process, resulting in a deemphasis of many important but difficult-to-measure areas. Some argue (Travis, 1976) that educational programs also should seek to make children feel better

about themselves. White sums up the problems with this educational goal vis-a-vis accountability, "There's nothing wrong with giving little kids a dose of happiness and hope except that you can't measure them" (Travis, 1976, p. 69).

Legal Issues

Legal issues which might be associated with assessment practices in Head Start center around the use of tests for classifying children and thereby potentially denying them equal educational opportunities.

There is no simple framework within which to describe the statutory, regulatory, and constitutional law affecting the testing of children for educational purposes. First, a great variety of tests exist which are used both in the schools and elsewhere. Second, the matter is complicated by the range of school classifications for which some tests may be used -- grading, tracking, (ability grouping), excluding children from the school system, placing students in special education or educable mentally retarded (EMR) classes, distinguishing children on the basis of their knowledge of a particular language, and separating classes or schools by sex, among others. Third, the issue is confused by numerous laws and legal theories which have emerged as grounds upon which to challenge the use of testing as a means of school classification -- federal and state constitutions, federal and state statutes, and federal (and perhaps state) regulations.

Sec. 601 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibits exclusion from, denial of the benefits, or subjection to and participation in discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance on the basis of race, color, or national

origin. Various states, notably California, have adopted education acts which may affect school classifications and/or bilingual instruction.

In addition to state legislation, there has also been legislation beyond the Civil Rights Act at the federal level. In 1974, the Education Amendments (P.L. 93-380) were passed. This legislation is sometimes referred to as the "Bill of Rights for Handicapped Children." It requires that all children be provided an education that is commensurate with their special needs. Further, it requires each state to have an officially adopted goal of educating all its handicapped children. The legislation calls for improved procedures and more reliable testing materials as a guard against racial and cultural discrimination. In 1976, Public Law 94-142 was passed to ensure that all handicapped children have available to them a free appropriate education and to ensure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents are protected.

Other effects on testing and related educational practices have resulted from judicial actions specifically involving the due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

The courts have also undertaken judicial review of school testing practices or any other decisions made by a school district or board. Traditionally, courts have deferred to the decision-making powers and expertise of administrative or quasi-administrative bodies, such as school boards. However, Brown vs. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) seems to have provided the impetus pursuant to which courts

have begun to scrutinize more closely certain practices and policies implemented by educational institutions.

The due process arises most often in exclusion cases. In the past, various school districts have excluded certain types of students from a school system -- the physically handicapped, the mentally retarded, students with alien status, and pregnant females, among others. The leading cases concerning exclusion as a denial of due process are Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children vs. Pennsylvania 343 F. Supp. 279 (E.D. PA 1972), Mills vs. Board of Education 348 F. Supp. 866 (D.D.C. 1972), and Lebanks vs. Spears, 60 FRD 135 (E.D. LA. 1973). In all three cases, mentally retarded children had been denied a public education.

In 1967, Hobson vs. Hansen, the plaintiffs claimed a denial of equal educational opportunity under the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. The school used achievement and aptitude tests to place students in "accelerated," "general," or "slow" classes. The court found the tests to be culturally biased because they were normed on a white middle-class sample. In Diana vs. the California State Board of Education (1970) Mexican-American plaintiffs claimed cultural bias in IQ tests which were used to place students in classes for the mentally retarded. The case was settled when it was agreed that the children would be retested in their primary language.

Denial of an education, essentially a public service, is viewed as a violation of the due process clause of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. Thus a state must admit mentally retarded children to its

school system and to those classes offered to others, or provide alternative special education classes. The due process requirements include a notice to parents of any decision to place a child deemed mentally retarded in a special education class, the parents' right to a hearing, and in some instances the assistance of counsel, cross examination by parents or counsel of school officials or others involved in the original decision, and the right of parents to have access to any material in a child's records, including testing scores. Appropriately conceived and carried out, a developmental assessment process is thoroughly consistent with the legislative intents and judicial decisions cited above. (See Appendix C).

Issues in Testing

The testing movement enjoyed a wide degree of public acceptance and institutional support during the period from World War I to about 1955. In recent years, however, the controversy regarding the use of tests has blossomed.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the American Association of School Administrators have urged reconsideration of the uses of test results. Groups of professionals and educators such as the Association of Black Psychologists and the National Education Association have called for a moratorium on testing of minority children.

According to Laosa (1976), the criticisms and controversy have been directed "in part at the basic logic of measurement of

human abilities and in part at the effects that the measurement procedures have had on our society" (p. 10). The attack on objective testing culminated in a series of publications during the early 1960's (Hoffman, 1962; Gross, 1962; Black, 1963) which have been reviewed and synthesized by Ebel (1963); Anastasi (1967) and Gosten (1968) among others. (See Samuda, 1975).

Although most of the controversy and concern revolves around the use of and misuse of "standardized" and "IQ" tests, it is not confined to them. Achievement tests, aptitude tests, and readiness tests are included and it can be precicted that developmental assessment will be suspect as well. Newsweek (January 10, 1977) reported the results of a judicial decision regarding a school district which did not promote a kindergarten child to first grade because he lacked "developmental readiness." The federal court jury ruled that the child's constitutional rights had been violated.

Messick and Anderson (1974) point out that two questions are involved in the testing controversy; (1) is the test adequate for the purposes? and (2) should the test be used? The first question is scientific and can be answered by appraising the test's psychometric properties, especially construct validity. The second question is ethical and can only be answered in terms of human values. They also pointed out that tests may measure different things for different groups, and may include terms that are more germane to one group than another. The possibility was raised that tests may accurately reflect ability or achievement levels that are in turn a reflection of adverse social forces that inhibited development.

Possible side effects of testing, appropriateness of a specific test for a particular purpose, misinterpretations, and misuse for secondary purposes were listed as disadvantages, but Messick and Anderson reminded readers that other means of appraisal have other drawbacks. Their viewpoints are similar to those held by many psychologists.

The 1974 revision of the American Psychological Associations' Standard for Educational and Psychological Tests extended APA guidelines to both test developers and test users, and to "any assessment procedure, assessment device, or assessment aid; that is, to any systematic basis for making inferences about people." They also stated that "many of the social ills attributed to tests, however, seem more a result of the ways in which tests have been used than of characteristics of the tests themselves" (1974, p. 2).

The Head Start population is primarily low-income "disadvantaged" children and parents, many of whom are of minority groups -- Indian, Puerto Rican, Chicano, and Black. Thus, Head Start is particularly vulnerable to criticisms of tests and testing.

These criticisms of tests include the whole concept of selecting and classifying human beings, the notion of "IQ," the misuses of testing and assessment results, the dominant culture orientation of items, lack of recognition of language differences, inappropriateness of items for children's backgrounds, ambiguity of items, classroom context of assessment of ability rather than "real life" assessment, the depressing effect of the test situation on children's performance, test apprehension, norming populations used, and others (Association of Black Psychologists, 1969, 1976; Williams, 1972;

Mackler and Holman, 1976). In addition, critics contend that assessment by its very nature is a political act (Rand Corporation, 1974). Dyer (1973) noted that

> The field of education has been strewn with politics and educational testing has become an instrument, if not a weapon, in the political process. And this means that our worries today about the mishandling of tests and the misuse of test scores must embrace not only school personnel, but also politicians and the diverse and pluralistic constituencies they serve" (p. 86).

At the present time there appears to be a large stockpile of standardized psychological evaluation instruments capable of assessing a broad spectrum of human performance. In addition, growing attention is being focused on less formal observational techniques which according to White (1973) show considerable promise. Despite general test availability, there are serious limitations in the ability of tests to evaluate performance in the non-cognitive or so-called affective sphere, which "...reflect(s) limitations of basic theory and conception of the underlying human functions..." (White, 1973, Vol. 1, p. 259).

Even the most widely accepted measurement instruments do not appear useful in providing guidance in program planning. IQ or achievement test results simply do not provide the teacher with information readily translatable into classroom practices.

Standardized test items are based on a concept of normal growth and development. There are no absolute definitions of what is good or bad in child development. According to White (1973, Vol. 1, p. 263)

> All tests of child development establish good and bad and average levels against norms. If a child's condition is identified as "bad" using the test, and if there is intervention to make it "good," it is implicitly trying to make the below average child average. Does this make sense?

Despite serious limitations in the existing tests used for developmental assessment and despite gaps in our understanding of child growth and development, most educators would agree that the educational process requires understanding of a child's starting point in a variety of areas...without this understanding a teacher may be functioning with one hand tied in attempting to plan a program which will encourage optimal growth in a variety of areas.

Training

The education and training of Head Start teachers, aides, directors, and other staff have been an integral part of Head Start since its inception. When Head Start was formed there were few teachers who had either experience or education in working with preprimary children, particularly those from low-income families. Head Start sponsored-and-funded forty-hour "orientation" weeks were the most common introduction staff had to organizing and planning the first summer Head Start programs.

Spodek (1972) reports that during the initial Head Start years, 56,000 teachers, aides and related personnel were trained in 40-hour orientation and training programs. During Head Start's initial three years, an average of 2,500 persons per year participated in 3 to 8 week training programs funded by Head Start and conducted by colleges and universities.

Most of this training was quite basic, geared to meet local needs and use local resources. It often combined practical experience with courses or course work designed to help trainees learn child development, cultural differences, the problems of poverty, and other relevant topics.

In keeping with the "career ladders" concept of adult participation in Head Start, trainees were also encouraged to seek out educational experiences to further their own education. In 1968, a Career Development Component to give local guidance and priorities was mandated for all funded Head Start programs.

Head Start has used a number of mechanisms to deliver training services to Head Start staff. These include direct funding to post- secondary institutions and research and development laboratories, regional and state training offices and officers, private contractors, and training grants for specific purposes. They have also, whenever possible, utilized appropriate training programs in collaboration with other agencies such as the U.S. Office of Education's "Follow Through," and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

Throughout all these efforts, emphasis continued upon regional and local response to local needs. This was also true of the technical assistance offered sites participating in Head Start Planned Variation, Home Start, and other demonstration programs. It was assumed that the training needs of a Head Start program in Philadelphia were different from the needs of one in South Dakota.

The largest focused training effort was the Child Development Associate Program (CDA) begun in 1973 with 12 CDA pilot training projects. Competencies expected of CDAs were carefully spelled out with the pilot training projects encouraged to develop their own procedures to help trainees master those competencies. Assessment was mentioned as a needed competency in three areas:

1) "Make observations on the growth and development of individual children and changes in group behavior, formally, or informally, verbally or in writing, and share this information with other staff..." (Competency F)

2) "Be able to assess special needs of individual children and call in specialist help where necessary." (Competency C)

3) "Assess levels of accomplishment for the individual child against the background of norms of attainment for a developmental stage." (Competency C)

Bilingual/bicultural CDA programs build upon the basic competencies, with almost all including language assessment for bilingual children.

The inclusion of handicapped children into ongoing Head Start programs created a need for specialized training. As before, this need was approached by emphasizing utilization of local resources, including the BEH "First Chance Network" outreach efforts.

In many cases, Head Start training has been in addition to education in child development, early childhood education, and related areas that teachers already had or were in the process of getting. For others, Head Start training was the entire education for teaching young children. As more teachers acquired basic teaching understandings and skills, time was available for

training in specialized topics, such as assessing, planning for and working with children with special needs, and planning and implementing a variety of approaches to meeting children's needs.

The relationship of the changing nature of this training to actual classroom practices is not known.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Methods and procedures used in the investigation are detailed in this chapter. Selected current and historical information about Head Start is followed by a section on each of the major components of the work: Field Study, Literature Review, Instrument Review and Consultant Assistance.

There are approximately four thousand six hundred (4,600) Head Start centers operated by one thousand three hundred seventy-four (1,374) grantees throughout the United States and its territories. The study population includes approximately twenty-three thousand (23,000) teachers and four thousand six hundred (4,600) directors who staff the Head Start program.

Characteristics of Head Start grantees, centers, and personnel vary widely, reflecting the local autonomy and responsiveness to community needs that have been encouraged since Head Start began. Community agencies, local governmental units, public schools, and private agencies sponsor Head Start programs that operate varying lengths of time, and have different staffing patterns, implementation strategies and organizational structures. The centers and classrooms are located in areas of poverty rather than being distributed evenly according to the child population. (See Figure 1 for regional breakdown). Settings range from densely

HEAD START REGIONS

NOTE: NUMBERS INDICATE THE PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL HEAD START CENTERS IN EACH REGION.

* INDICATES THOSE STATES IN REGION II

REGION 2 ALSO INCLUDES PUERTO RICO & THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
REGION 9 ALSO INCLUDES HAWAII, THE TRUST TERRITORIES, & AMERICAN SAMOA
REGION 10 ALSO INCLUDES ALASKA

FIGURE I

populated urban to isolated rural with resulting variations in access to support services, number of centers in an administrative unit, home or center-base of service, and ease of supervision and training. Within these variations, all are working toward the broad program goal of providing a comprehensive developmental program to meet the needs of low-income children and their families. Developmental assessment and program planning to meet the needs of individual children, are affected by Head Start's diversity and variability, as well as by commonality of purpose, legislative mandates, social and educational trends, the incomplete and inadequate knowledge base regarding assessment, limited financial resources, and lack of agreement on processes of assessment and program planning.

The methods and procedures of the investigation were designed to gather pertinent information on both variability and commonality, as well as information directly related to classroom practices, since all were needed to help identify present status and future needs in developmental assessment and individualization.

Field Study

The field study was undertaken for two reasons. First, it was designed to collect data on present developmental assessment practices in Head Start classrooms. Second, it was designed to collect information that would assist in the investigation of the relationship between developmental assessment practices and individualization for children. The field study has consisted of two questionnaires, a director/education coordinator questionnaire and a teacher questionnaire

(see Appendix F), and will include one round of site visits. Questionnaires were sent to one thousand nine hundred seventy-three (1,973) program operators. The director questionnaire served to take a census of the population of program operators rather than a sample. Program operators were defined as either (1) grantees that operate Head Start programs (as opposed to fiscal agents only); and (2) principal program-operating delegate agencies. Either the director, education coordinator, (or person who fulfills those functions) in each program operation was asked to fill out this questionnaire, which was designed to gather general program and demographic data, as well as to collect data on developmental assessment practices and instruments used in Head Start Programs.

The teacher questionnaire was sent to a sample of one thousand nine hundred seventy-three (1,973) teachers, one from each program operating unit as defined above. Directors were asked to select teachers to complete the teacher questionnaire according to a set of random numbers and instructions enclosed with each questionnaire. To determine the number of actual teachers represented by the respondent, information on the staff at each agency was obtained from the Director and from program data provided by the Office of Child Development. Teacher's responses will be weighted according to number of teachers he/she represented. This sampling approach was based on the assumption that the practices of one teacher generally would reflect the practices of others in the program and that deviations from this pattern would be random and independent. This weighting has not been done on the preliminary computer runs summarized in Chapter IV of this report.

The teacher questionnaire was designed to gather information on specific classroom developmental assessment practices, teacher perceptions of instrument utility in assessment and individualization, and teacher training and experience, as well as specific information on the assessment instruments used.

Demographic information necessary to discern trends and relationships, such as location, characteristics of children, agency affiliation (public school, community action, local government, or private) was obtained from existing Office of Child Development data, and from the director and teacher questionnaires.

Site visits will take place between October 15, 1977 and January 15, 1978. The visits will permit a validation of questionnaire data, where appropriate, and the collection of additional information not easily obtained from written questionnaires.

Questionnaire Development

The two questionnaires used in the study were designed concurrently and are discussed together in this section.

Conceptualization of variables and issued hypothesized to be related to classroom practices preceeded questionnaire development. These fall into the following major areas: teacher training and experience, site location and characteristics; child characteristics, instrument characteristics, teacher and director perception of assessment procedures and instruments, and related classroom practices. Questions, cover letters, and format of questionnaires were developed for field

testing and review. The questionnaires were developed in three phases: conceptualization and specification, formative evaluation, and final editing and preparation.

The first phase involved the conceptualization of the total study, the isolation of variables to be considered, the identification of study questions to be addressed, and the determination of the function of the director/education coordinator and teacher questionnaires within the total study. Draft questionnaires were constructed after specification of desired information.

Formative evaluation of the questionnaires was of three types: pilot testing of cover letters, instructions, and questionnaires on a local Head Start population; review, reactions, and suggestions from the regional and national Office of Child Development; and review, reactions and suggestions from the Review Panel and consultants. These activities did not occur sequentially but simultaneously, with the exception of pilot testing of the successive drafts of the questionnaires.

Pilot testing was done by eight trained Project staff. Written procedures were developed for training sessions. Respondents for the pilot testing were Head Start directors and teachers. After the tester explained the purpose of the project and the pilot testing, the respondents filled out the questionnaires. Following that, the tester went through the questionnaires with the respondent, going over each item to check for ambiguities, and to obtain comments and suggestions from the respondents. Testers wrote these on a duplicate

copy of the questionnaire. Each tester submitted a written and oral report following the pilot testing.

As revisions were made incorporating suggestions from Head Start staff, OCD personnel and Review Panel members, additional testing was conducted with different respondents. This cycle was repeated five times, until teachers responded to instructions and items with a minimum number of questions and misunderstandings and the desired information could be supplied within twenty minutes. All participating directors and teachers were sent a thank you letter.

Several problems were encountered in the pretesting. Terminology was consistently confusing. There was uncertainty about the meaning and interpretation of such terms as developmental assessment, evaluation, testing and screening. In addition, perceptions of the steps involved in developmental assessment varied greatly from teacher to teacher. More specifically, some terms such as "assess" and "adult-child ratio" were unfamiliar to the respondents. These were carefully explained during the pretesting, and after discussion another phrasing of the question was prepared for use in the final questionnaire.

As much as possible, census-like indicators were used: "How many adults are helping you in your class <u>today?</u>" The necessary computations to determine ratios and percentages were made during data analysis.

Changes in the questionnaires as a result of this formative development process made them less abstract, more specific, and more direct. Instructions were expanded to include definitions and

examples. Wording was sharpened to focus the responses and to facilitate coding, analysis, and interpretation. A combination of closed and open questions was developed to respond to the teacher's need to "be able to say what I think," and to obtain information not amenable to collection through closed questions.

National Office of Child Development approval of the final teacher questionnaire was obtained, and the instrument was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for approval on December 16, 1976. Approval was received on March 14, 1977. Questionnaires were mailed on March 21, 1977 to the 1,973 Head Start program-operating units funded by the Office of Child Development.

Post-paid pre-addressed return envelopes for both teacher and director/education coordinator questionnaires were enclosed.

Listed below are specific steps followed in data collection:

1. Preparation and mailing of final questionnaires.
2. Logging of returns.
3. Sending follow-up letters and duplicate questionnaires to non-respondents.
4. Logging returns to second mailing.
5. Sampling of non-respondents to determine the similarity or lack of similarity to respondents.

A log book was maintained with the date of mailing of the questionnaires, date and record of the response, date of a second letter and questionnaires to non-respondents, and date and record of response to that letter.

One permanent staff member was assigned to open returned questionnaires. This person

a. Date-stamped each questionnaire as it was received

b. Put identification labels on the loose instrument questionnaires that were included as part of the teacher questionnaire.

c. Stacked questionnaires in separate piles -- Director and Teacher

d. Kept a running record of total number returned and dates returned.

As of April 21, 1977, 17.7% of the director questionnaires and 13.6% the teacher questionnaires were returned. A second mailing of questionnaires was sent on April 22, 1977, to all program operators who had not responded to the first request. All questionnaires received on or before June 10 were coded and analyzed. At that time, 959 or 48.6% of the director questionnaires were returned. 929 or 47.1% of the teacher questionnaires were returned.

To assure independence of the teacher sample from the director census, the respondents were instructed to return the questionnaires separately. Because of this, the match between questionnaires returned from teachers and those returned from directors is not perfect. Each program operation was assigned an ID (agency) code which will permit analyses of congruence of information between teacher and director questionnaire. This anslysis is in progress.

To check for possible differences between respondents and non-respondents, a sample of ten non-respondent programs matched by location and other variables with ten respondent programs was surveyed by telephone between June 6 and June 13. Answers to questionnaire items were obtained from the director and from one teacher in each program-operating unit. Data from these non-respondent programs will be analyzed and compared with the matched respondent program.

Coding Procedures

Development of the coding procedures was begun when the questionnaires were in final form. Coding for the closed questions was developed by staff in conjunction with a computer specialist and the procedures to be followed were written in a coding manual.

Coding for the open-ended questions was deferred until the first 100 questionnaires were returned so that response categories could be developed. These instructions appeared in a series of appendices to the Coding Manual. The appendices were developed as follows:

The first 50 responses to each open-ended question were written down. Responses were organized into a logical framework, so that

a. Similar responses could be coded with one number

b. Analysis of the question could be facilitated

The coding scheme was checked by coding the remaining 50 questions. Three major revisions of the appendices were made over a period of three weeks. All questionnaires were coded using the final appendices.

The Coding Manual

The Coding Manual (see Appendix G) was written, tested by a staff member, and revised. Contents of the manual are listed below.

a. General Instructions

b. Coding for Director Questionnaire

c. Coding for Teacher Questionnaire

d. Coding for Instrument Questionnaire

e. Appendices (coding for open-ended questions)

f. Notes

Training sessions for the staff members assigned to coding concentrated on establishing accuracy and quality control. Establishing inter-rater reliability on the open-ended questions required extensive rater practice and refinement of response categories, and was facilitated by having pairs of raters code responses to only one or two questions. Training continued until the percentage of agreement between coders was greater than eighty-five per cent (85%).

Final Coding Procedures

Two staff members coded closed response questions.

Six staff members coded the open-ended questions and verified the coding of the closed questions.

Quality control procedures required that:

1. Limited-response coding be checked and verified.

2. Open-ended coding be completed and verified.

3. The last coder to handle the questionnaire check all coding for accuracy.

4. One person be responsible for final check.

Thus, all questionnaires were checked three (3) times to ensure coding accuracy.

Instrument Coding

Coding of developmental assessment instruments required a separate appendix and procedure. The assigning of codes to instruments was done by one (1) person, and checked by the final checker. The appendix was reviewed periodically to eliminate duplication and ensure accuracy.

Literature Review

The purpose of the Literature Review was to identify existing information on developmental assessment and the considerations associated with developmental assessment procedures and instruments. Areas of investigation were

A. Basic Questions. Basic issues related to developmental assessment included such questions as what developmental assessment was, how it related to other forms of assessment, why it was done, and relationship to program decisions.

B. Population Under Study. Facts regarding the Head Start program, population it serves, and the staff it employs were collected and organized under this heading.

C. Trends. The trends section of the outline focused on the recent history of Head Start and factors affecting the use of assessment procedures and instruments. It also contained documentation of substantive issues such as cultural bias, and programatic issues such as sources of funding which could affect assessment and individualization practices.

D. Assessment Variables. This major category included a number of topics relating to assessment and individualization practices:

   1. Legal Issues. Selected legislation, court rulings, regulations, and other current documents related to assessment, evaluation, "testing," program planning and placement of children were reviewed for their relationship to the questions being studied.

2. Demographic Variables. The possible relationship of demographic variables such as geographic location, proximity to post secondary education institutions, and city or town size to factors related to assessment and program planning practices were explored.

3. Technical Variables. Questions related to past and current problems in testing and assessment, including normative, criterion, and content referencing, and techniques appropriate for assessing young children were reviewed. Difficulties associated with standardization and the issues related to the adequacy of measurement and evaluation techniques were also reviewed.

4. Use Variables. "Use" variables were the factors which facilitated or inhibited the use of specific assessment instruments, such as the time required to administer, costs associated with various instruments, and the usefulness of the instruments in terms of teacher perception of the children's needs. Also included was research on the relationship of education and training to the teacher's use of assessment instruments.

Procedures of the Literature Review

The Literature Review began on October 1, 1976. The basic topics to be covered were identified and outlined. A standard form (see Appendix H) developed to record findings included identification of the material being reviewed, the title, bibliographic material, and the following categories:

1. Issue/Problem: the central idea of the material.
2. Assumptions/Theoretical Orientation: basic orientation and assumptions of the author(s).
3. Main Terms: specific terms used by the author.
4. Points: the main points
5. Personal Biases: the reviewer's reactions
6. Key Quotes: specific quotes

The forms were routinely submitted for compilation in the Literature Outline, which was updated monthly. One staff member collated and merged new information into the Literature Outline on a continuing basis. The outline itself was reviewed and distributed to all staff for review and comment once a month. The Literature Outline was also reviewed and discussed by the Review Panel at their meeting in Denver on February 6, 7, and 8, 1977.

These procedures provided a continuing update of material reviewed, a systematic way to identify the interrelationships among work being undertaken by individual researchers, a consistent method for identifying issues and their relative importance to the overall work of the study, and a method for storage and retrieval of the information.

The Literature Outline categories were regrouped for this narrative report.

Data Bases and Sources

Previously commissioned studies for the Office of Child Development were beginning sources for the literature review. These included

Boger, R.P. & Knight, S.S. Social-Emotional Task Force Final Report. Michigan State University, 1969. OEO Contract 4118. (mimeographed).

Head Start Test Collection at the Educational Testing Service.

Judge Baker Guidance Center. Head Start Assessment Materials. (mimeographed) Boston: Judge Baker Guidance Center, no date.

Raizen, S., Bobrow, S.B. and others. Design for a National Evaluation of Social Competence in Head Start Children, Santa Monica, Ca.: Rand Corporation, 1974.

Walker, D.K., Bone, M.J., Bryk, A. The Quality of the Head Start Planned Variation Data. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Huron Institute, 1973.

White, Sheldon H., et al. Federal Programs for Young Children: Review and Recommendations. Volumes I - IV. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1973 (Pub. No. (05) 74-101).

Reviews were conducted of selected current journals, books, and handbooks. The following data bases and sources were searched in addition to the sources cited in the bibliography.

CIJE

Child Development Abstracts and Bibliography

Dissertation Abstracts

Education Index

ERIC/ECE

Head Start Research Reports

Review of Educational Research

Instrument Review

The review of developmental assessment instruments was designed to provide a description of selected assessment instruments either actually used or potentially useful in Head Start classes by Head Start classroom staff.

Consistent with the purpose of the contract, it was assumed that each of the following groups have the following interests in assessment instruments.

1. Head Start Staff
   - Information about developmental assessment instruments and procedures
   - Characteristics of the most commonly used instruments
2. Federal Officials
   - Use of assessment instruments in the process of individualization
   - Need for additional instruments
   - Need to norm and/or validate existing widely used instruments
3. Research and Development Community
   - State of the art relative to assessment instruments
   - Criteria which should guide the development of future assessment processes

The procedures and forms developed to review instruments were designed to:

- Respond to the needs of each of the above users, as far as possible
- Produce useful descriptions of instruments commonly used in Head Start
- Avoid duplicating existing work in the field such as Johnson & Bomarito (1971) and Johnson (1976).

Examples of these forms and the instrument review manual are in Appendix I. Procedures for review of the local instruments are in Appendix J.

The procedures provided a framework which allowed several staff members to produce comparable reviews of assessment instruments.

Criteria for Instrument Selection

It is estimated by the Office of Child Development (OCD) and the Educational Testing Service (ETS), among others, that over five thousand instruments are currently available to assess children's functioning in various developmental areas. These include commercially developed instruments, instruments developed by teachers, specialists, or other local staff, instruments developed as part of research and demonstration projects, and research tools.

Because of the availability of such a large number of instruments, and to avoid duplication of previous reviews, the initial criteria for instruments to be reviewed were stringent. They are listed below with a brief explanation.

1. Classroom teacher vs. Diagnostician/Specialist

   First priority went to those instruments which could be administered and interpreted by the classroom staff alone, without assistance of a specialist.

2. Age range will be from three to five years old (36 months up to and including 60 months)

   The staff reviewed instruments which included this age range but were not necessarily restricted to it. For example, an instrument designed for use from birth to six years would be included in the review. An instrument designed for use from age of six years up would not be included.

3. Published Instruments

Only published instruments were reviewed. "Published" was defined as published by a commercial publisher, a university press, or similar publishing house. Review of "locally" developed instruments will use other procedures.

4. Training Time

The longer the length of training time necessary for the teacher and/or specialist to become competent in administering an instrument, the lower priority the instrument received. We were initially interested in those instruments which required a minimum or moderate amount of training.

5. Length of Time to Administer

Instruments which take a minimal amount of time to administer or which can be administered in distinct units, are the most likely to be used in classroom settings.

6. Frequency of Use in Head Start

Instruments that are widely used in Head Start were given priority. Frequency of use was determined by data from the questionnaires and consultation with knowledgeable sources.

7. Usefulness for Program Planning

Instruments that provided results useful for program planning were considered.

8. Validity/Reliability

Instruments for which technical data existed were given priority. At a later date instruments for which technical data are not available may be reviewed.

Quality Control Procedures

The internal and external procedures for quality control employ three basic means of ensuring high quality reviews:

1. In-house procedures to ensure a consistent high quality product;
2. External reviews to check on quality and judgments; and
3. Empirical testing with members of the target groups or users expected to benefit from the work of the project.

Each is discussed below.

1. In-House Quality Control

   In-house quality control was assured by training, development of adequate instructions and format for reviews, and supervision and final checking. To ensure a common frame of reference when instruments were evaluated, a form with appropriate categories and a reviewer handbook with adequate descriptions and examples were developed. All reviewers were trained in the use of these. Consistency of content was checked by one individual sensitive both to accuracy of facts reported and to issues of judgment.

2. External Reviews

   The Review Panel studied and made suggestions to improve the Instrument Review handbook, as well as recommendations about the choice of instruments to be reviewed. Other appropriate external reviews will be made depending upon the nature of the final product.

3. Empirical Testing

   Samples of reviews will be sent to members of user groups for review and comment. This will be done by using the Resource Access Projects (RAPS) programs and organizations in the early childhood field.

Work Plan

Identification and selection of instruments to be reviewed relied on professional publications, correspondence with developers, discussions with professionals in the field, and questionnaire results.

Professional publications. The staff developed a list of instruments commonly identified or reviewed in the literature by reviewing the instruments which most frequently appear in the following publications:

Buros, O.K. (Ed.). The seventh mental measurements yearbook (2 vols.). Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1972.

Frankenburg, W.K. & Camp, B.W. (Eds.). Pediatric screening tests. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1975.

Hoepfner, R., Stern, C., & Nummedal, S.G. (Eds.). CSE-ECRC preschool/kindergarten test evaluations. UCLA Graduate School of Education: Center for the Study of Evaluation & the Early Childhood Research Center, 1971.

Johnson, O.G. Tests and measurements in child development: Handbook II (2 vols.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Johnson, O.G., & Bommarito, J.W. Tests and measurements in child development: Handbook I. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1971.

Walker, D.K. Socioemotional measures for preschool and kindergarten children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Having reviewed and listed the instruments identified in those sources, the staff compiled a summary list of instruments which appear in several of the lists identified above. This list served to identify particularly appropriate instruments and to verify the existence of instruments mentioned by Head Start staff.

To acquire information on recently published instruments, the staff wrote to major publishers for lists of newly published instruments and instruments in development, and reviewed Child Development Abstracts, 1975 to present, for tests developed by research projects.

Discussions with professionals. Identification of the actual frequency of the use of specific instruments in Head Start was not available until the questionnaires were returned, but preliminary identification was done by

1. Telephone calls to the Resource Access Projects (RAPS) to ask what instruments they thought were commonly used;
2. A review of the ETS Head Start Test Collection;
3. A review of Federal publications identifying instruments which are used -- particularly publications from the Office of Child Development and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped;
4. Asking Review Panel members to identify instruments they thought were commonly used.

Having done this, the list of instruments resulting from discussions with professionals was matched with the list of instruments that appeared in more than one of the books reviewed.

Merging of information from these various sources with frequency analysis from the questionnaires will result in the final listing of instruments to be reviewed.

Information from the teacher questionnaires about the instruments will supplement other judgments and reactions about the utility of the instruments reviewed.

To date, thirteen instruments were selected and reviewed using the procedures outlined above. The list appears in Appendix K.

Consultant Assistance

From the outset of the Project, the staff sought assistance from a wide range of people, organizations, and agencies to take full benefit from previous work, remain aware of concerns and needs of potential users, utilize experts in particular areas related to the study, and to review work in progress.

Specialists and representatives from the regional and national Office of Child Development, the Resource Access Projects (RAPS), professional organizations, researchers in specialized areas related to developmental assessment, and others were consulted frequently. Local Head Start program staff -- teachers, administrators, and specialists -- contributed their own expertise through reviews, informal discussions and consultation, pilot testing, and of course the questionnaires.

In addition to the informal meetings with individuals in the groups described above, a formal Review Panel was organized to monitor and assist in the work of the Project. The composition and contributions of each of these groups and individuals are discussed in this section.

Review Panel

Members of the Review Panel included:

Ms. Christine F. Branche
Director, Division of Early Childhood Education
Cleveland Public Schools
1380 East Sixth Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Dr. Ralph Colvin
1833 South Boulevard
Conway, Arkansas 72032

Dr. Edward DeAvila
3528 Robinson Drive
Oakland, California

Dr. Joan Dickerson
Panhandle CDA
421½ Sherman Avenue
Couer D'Alene, Idaho 83814

Dr. Gene Glass
College of Education
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Dr. Jean Berko Gleason
Department of Psychology
Boston University
64 Cummington Street
Boston, Massachusetts

Dr. William Goodwin
Early Childhood Education
University of Colorado at Denver
Denver, Colorado 80202

Dr. Asa Hilliard
Urban Institute for Human Services
P. O. Box 15068
San Francisco, California 94115

Dr. Merle Karnes
Institute for Child Behavior and Development
University of Illinois
Champaign-Urbana, Illinois 61820

Dr. Lilian Katz
Institute for Child Behavior and Development
University of Illinois
Champaign-Urbana, Illinois 61820

Dr. Shari Nedler
Early Childhood Education
University of Colorado at Denver
Denver, Colorado 80202

Ms. Diana Pefley
Mile High Consortium
Hampden East I, Room 215
8000 E. Girard Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80231

These people were selected because of their particular expertise with regard to developmental assessment practices and instruments and their knowledge of early childhood education.

In addition to the Review Panel, members of the professional staff of the Office of Child Development were consulted on a regular basis. These included:

Dr. Ray Collins, Chief of Program Development and Innovation

Dr. Pam Coughlin, Director of Special Projects

Mr. Jerry Lapides, Program Development and Innovation Branch

Dr. Al Smith, Day Care Division

Regularly scheduled meetings with the Review Panel were held on February 6, 7, and 8, 1977, in Denver, Colorado and on May 26 and 27, 1977, in El Paso, Texas. (See Appendix M - N). At the Denver meeting, the Review Panel considered the Literature Outline which documented progress on the Literature search, the forms and procedures for the review of assessment instruments, the questionnaires to be used, issues related to developmental assessment practices and instruments, and guidelines for future work. At the El Paso meeting, the Panel reviewed preliminary drafts of the Interm Report, a discussion paper on developmental assessment, an outline of the areas to be investigated during the site visits and preliminary data collected through the use of the questionnaires.

Some members of the Review Panel had additional responsibilities as specialist-consultant for the project. These included

- Dr. Edward DeAvila, who assisted the staff with regard to the development of the questionnaires, the analysis of the data and most particularly with the procedures and forms to be used in the review of assessment procedures.
- Dr. Gene Glass, who assisted in the review of the questionnaires, determination of the sampling procedures, and analysis and interpretation of the data.
- Dr. William Goodwin, who worked with the staff on the procedures and forms to be used in the review of the instruments, procedures to be followed for empirically testing the products of the project, and who reviewed the questionnaires.
- Dr. Shari Nedler, who consulted with the staff on the discussion paper on developmental assessment as well as questionnaires and the data analysis procedures.

In addition, the staff was assisted by members of professional and research organizations. A staff member spent a week reviewing materials in the ETS Test Collection and discussing issues related to the use of assessment instruments. She met with

Joan Baratz (Research)

Nancy Bruno (Testing)

Edward Chittenden (Research)

Thomas Donlon (Testing)

Walter Emmerich (Research)

Eleanor Horne (ERIC Tests and Measurement Clearinghouse)

Louis Laosa (Research)

Pamela Rosen (Head Start Test Collection)

Irving Sigel (Research)

Matthew Shepherd (Testing)

Virginia Shipman (Research)

In addition to this, the staff worked with representatives of the National Education Association, the Children's Defense Fund, the Rand Corporation, representatives of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Institute for Educational Leadership, and the Resource Access Project Directors, and representatives of the Office of Child Development.

Each of these individuals and groups assisted in the identification of relevant information to be considered in the course of the study.

Practitioner Review

Teachers, specialists, and administrators of the Head Start Programs were particularly helpful throughout the course of the study. They assisted in the development of the questionnaires, and participated in discussions about the process of developmental assessment and the instruments used in that process. Individuals working in the Head Start programs also reviewed written products and assisted in the refinement of these so that they would be particularly useful to Head Start staff throughout the nation.

ITC staff presented the work of the project at the El Paso OCD Conference, "Parents, Children and Continuity." Approximately 50 participants attended this session, discussed the work of the project, and received draft copies of a paper on developmental assessment to review. Responses to both the session and the paper have been helpful, informative, and supportive.

The methods and procedures followed in the field study, literature review, instrument review, and consultant assistance laid the groundwork for the next phases of the investigation, data analysis and interpretation.

Data analysis was done using the Statistical Package for the Social Studies, with special programs being written as required.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

The information presented in this chapter is based upon data collected and analyzed prior to July 15, 1977, and must be viewed as quite preliminary, with findings tentative and subject to modification. For this reason, no conclusions are included at this time, only summary statements and tables.

The data presented represent information gathered through two mailed questionnaires; verification and further identification of practices and procedures through on-site interviews and observations will be carried out October 15, 1977 through January 15, 1978.

The data presented represent only center-based program operations. Home Start, combination home and center-based, and any other combinations are not included at this time.

The data presented represent unweighted teacher responses, and may change when adjustment for size of program operation is done.

Correlations are not included at this time. Information collected to enable explanation of possible relationships of assessment and individualization, such as amount of adult-child contact, and teacher training and experience, is included.

The data are presented as follows:

- Statement of question asked
- Summary of findings, including tables when appropriate

Information from both questionnaires, is interspersed as appropriate to answer questions. The order differs from the order of the research questions in the introduction.

Who Are the Respondents?

The teacher sample consists of 773 classroom teachers in Head Start centers after duplicates, Home Start sites, and other special responses were set aside from the total return of 929. (See Table 1).

Six hundred fifty-seven administrators or education coordinators constitute the "director" sample after duplicates, Home Start sites, and other special responses were set aside from the return total of 959. (See Table 1). Fifty-five percent of the director questionnaires were filled out by directors, 20% by education coordinators, 2.5% by director/education coordinators, and 16.4% by superintendents, coordinators or directors of special programs, early childhood directors, and so forth.

Where Are the Programs That Responded Located?

Forty-two percent of the program operations are located in rural areas, 22.5% are located in cities of less than 50,000, and 27% in cities over 50,000. Only 5.5% are in city suburbs. Table 2 shows the complete population density breakdown of respondents.

Ninety-two percent of the programs are located within fifty miles of a college, university, or other training resource.

TABLE 1

BREAKDOWN OF QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS

Returns	Teachers	Directors
Total as of 6/10	929	959
Total Usable	847	926
Total Center-Based	773	657

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION BY POPULATION OF PROGRAM OPERATION

Location	Frequency	Percent
Cities over 50,000	175	26.7
Over 300,000	74	11.3
100,000 - 300,000	46	7.0
50,000 - 100,000	55	8.4
Cities less than 50,000	148	22.5
Suburb	36	5.5
Over 100,000	32	4.9
50,000 - 100,000	4	0.6
Rural	147	41.7
Within 50 miles of a city over 100,000	53	8.1
Within 50 miles of city 50,000 - 100,000	61	9.3
Within 50 miles of a city up to 50,000	127	19.3
More than 50 miles from a city	33	5.0
No Response	24	3.7

What Are the Structural Characteristics of the Program Operation and the Classrooms?

Size of program operation for center-based programs is determined by the number of teachers and number of children in a given program operation, as shown in Tables 3 and 4.

There is much variability in the size of Head Start program operations. Ninety-six programs had two teachers, the mode for this distribution. The most frequently reported number of children in a program operation was 60.

Class size, adult-child ratio, and length of time children attend are used as indicators of classroom structure and adult-child contact. Table 5 profiles these characteristics.

This profile of a "typical" classroom does not reflect the variation that exists in adult-child contact. While 52% operate the same length of time as a traditional school year, eight percent of the program operators reporting operate only two months a year -- the Head Start summer program. Twenty percent operate ten months, and 20% operate year-round (11 and 12 months).

Although five hours of adult-child contact a day is the mean, 10% of the program operators report that the children are at the center eight hours a day, and 37% report being open more chan five hours. Analysis to date does not indicate how many of these are double sessions, 2 or 3 full days a week, or

TABLE 3

SIZE OF PROGRAM OPERATION: NUMBER OF TEACHERS PER PROGRAM

Number of Teachers	Programs Reporting	
	Frequency	Percent
1 and 2	141	21.5
3 - 5	184	28.0
6 - 10	162	24.7
11 - 20	106	16.1
20 +	52	8.8
No Response	11	1.7

TABLE 4

SIZE OF PROGRAM OPERATION: NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER PROGRAM

Number of Children	Programs Reporting	
	Frequency	Percent
0 - 40	140	21.6
41 - 100	222	34.4
101 - 200	157	24.2
201-400	86	13.2
400 +	38	5.5
No Response	13	2.0

TABLE 5

CHARACTERISTICS OF HEAD START CLASSROOMS

	Mean	Mode
Days per week that children attend center	4.7	5
Hours per day that children attend center	5.0	4
Months per year	9.1	9
Class size	19.2	20
Number of adults in classroom	3.9	3
Paid aides	1.3	1
Parents	1.1	1
Others	.8	0
Mean adult-child ratio	1.5	

other time variations because of special conditions. These variables will need further study, as 17% of the teachers report that they taught two classes, with the number of children in the second class approximately the same as the first. Seventy-three percent of the programs operate five days a week. Twenty-five percent operate four days a week.

What Training and Teaching-Related Experience Do Head Start Teachers Have?

Ninety-seven percent of the teachers reporting have received training in working with young children, with 57% having a college degree in early childhood education, child development, or in a related area. Twelve percent have completed the Child Development Associate, and another 24% are "in progress." The pattern of this training is quite varied, as shown in Table 6.

Ninety-three percent of the teachers report they have received some training in using assessment instruments. The pattern of this training is varied, and the data suggest considerable overlap, with one type of training in addition to, or complementing another, as shown in Table 7. The "other" category includes workshops, outside consultants, the instrument manual, and so forth.

Forty-five percent of the teachers reporting have been aides before they were teachers, and 23% have been Head Start parents. Classroom teaching experience is profiled in Table 8. Teaching experience is not evenly distributed among respondents. Forty-one

TABLE 6

TEACHER TRAINING IN TEACHING YOUNG CHILDREN

Type of Training	Frequency	Percent
Head Start Training	358	46.3
Inservice	704	91.1
CDA completed	91	11.8
CDA in progress	187	24.2
College Courses in child development	125	16.2
College degree in early childhood education or child development	271	35.1
College degree in related area	195	25.3
Masters degree in early childhood education or child development	68	8.8

Note. Categories are not mutually exclusive.

TABLE 7

TEACHER TRAINING IN USING ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

Type of Training	Frequency	Percent
Inservice training		
One week or less	362	
More than one week	232	30.0
Extended training		
More than one month	126	16.4
CDA	136	17.6
College Courses	398	51.5
Other	104	12.8

Note. Categories are not mutually exclusive.

TABLE 8

TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF HEAD START TEACHERS

	Mean	Mode
Total years teaching experience	7.1	3
Head Start teaching experience	4.6	1
If previously an aide, years experience as an aide	2.6	1

percent of the teachers have four or fewer years total teaching experience, while 57% have four or fewer years teaching in Head Start.

What Is the Language and Ethnic/Racial Composition of Head Start Classes?

Information to date on the language and ethnic/racial composition of the classes taught by the responding Head Start teachers is presented in Tables 9 and 10. The information should be interpreted as preliminary and incomplete. Like all the data from the teacher questionnaires, the responses are unweighted for number of classrooms in a program operation. Only one teacher in a given program operation filled out the questionnaire. Thus, at this stage of analysis, the teacher in a small program in West Virginia or New Mexico carries as much weight as the teacher in a large program operation in San Diego, Chicago or Atlanta. Final analysis and reporting will use weighted data.

Table 9 presents the unweighted data on percent of children per class who speak English as a first language. Table 10 presents the non-white grouping of the ethnic and racial composition.

Both questions are receiving further analysis for finer definition of language and ethnic/racial composition.

TABLE 9

LANGUAGE BACKGROUND OF HEAD START CLASSROOMS

Percent of Students Who Speak English As A First Language	Number of Classrooms	Percent of Classrooms
0 - 9 percent	22	2.8
10 - 39 percent	49	6.3
40 - 59 percent	36	4.7
60 - 89 percent	91	11.8
90 - 100 percent	561	72.8
No Response	14	2.0

Note. Based on unweighted data.

TABLE 10

ETHNIC AND RACIAL COMPOSITION OF
HEAD START CLASSROOMS

Percent of Non-White Students Per Class	Number of Classrooms	Percent of Classrooms
0 - 9 percent	165	21.3
10 - 39 percent	137	17.7
40 - 59 percent	72	9.3
60 - 89 percent	164	21.2
90 - 100 percent	189	24.5
No Response	46	6.0

Note. Based on unweighted data.

What Do Directors Report About the Assessment Procedures Teachers In Their Program Use?

Directors reported that teachers in their Head Start program use a wide variety of assessment procedures, as shown in Table 11.

Twenty-one percent reported that their teachers use other assessment practices as well. These responses fall into three major categories:

- Team meetings are reported by 4%
- Home visits are reported by 1.8%
- Consultants are reported by 10%
- The remaining 5.3% are scattered

Directors were asked to report the assessment practice they thought was the most useful for learning about what a child knows and can do. Thirty-three percent specified observation, 21% specified assessment instruments, and 11% specified a combination of methods. These three methods were specified far more frequently than any others, as shown in Table 12.

All the directors report that their teachers find assessment procedures and instruments helpful in developing an individual plan for each child. Only 62% of the directors answered the "open" question of how assessment helps or doesn't help in this process. Learning about the child (23%) and planning (19%) are listed far more often than any other responses. Only 6% of the responses indicate that even though the instruments are helpful, there are some aspects of them that present problems. Problem areas include

TABLE 11

DIRECTORS' REPORT: ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES TEACHERS USE

Method	Frequency	Percent
Observation		
General	629	95.7
Systematic	440	67.0
Notetaking	583	76.6
Assessment instruments	618	94.1
Samples of child's work	497	75.6
Talking with parents	628	95.6
Talking with other teachers and aides	541	82.3

Note. Categories are not mutually exclusive.

TABLE 12

DIRECTORS' REPORT: MOST USEFUL METHODS FOR LEARNING ABOUT WHAT A CHILD KNOWS AND CAN DO

Method	Frequency	Percent
Observation	215	32.7
General	104	15.8
Systematic	111	16.9
Notetaking	34	5.2
Assessment Instruments	136	20.7
Samples of child's work	8	1.2
Talking to parents	13	2.0
Talking with other teachers and aides	2	.3
Team meetings	3	.5
Consultants	1	.2
Combination of methods	72	11.0
Other	2	.3
No response	171	26.0

such things as lack of time to administer, lack of time to plan, instruments too long and complicated, staff needs training, and information not relevant.

Table 13 displays the director's responses on how assessment helps teachers plan for the children.

What Assessment Procedures Do Teachers Report They Use?

Teachers respond that they use a wide variety of ways to keep track of children's progress, as shown in Table 14. Other ways mentioned are home visits, working with consultants, and team meetings.

Asked to identify which one of the assessment procedures is the most helpful in planning for individual children, 11.6% did not respond. Responses show that teachers consider the following procedures most helpful in planning for individual children:

- Observation is specified by 42.5%
- Samples of the child's work is specified by 18.9%
- A combination of methods is specified by 16%

Table 15 shows the complete response pattern.

Ninety-two percent of the responding teachers say they use assessment instruments. Teachers who do not use assessment instruments were given an opportunity to say why they choose not to.

The number of teachers checking any one response is small (12 was the largest). In descending frequency, they are:

TABLE 13

DIRECTORS' REPORT: HOW INFORMATION FROM ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES AND INSTRUMENTS HELPS TEACHERS PLAN

How Assessment Helps	Frequency	Percent
Helps refer child	7	1.1
Helps learn about child	154	23.4
Helps learn about child's weaknesses	30	4.6
Helps learn about child's strengths	9	1.4
Helps keep track of child's progress	10	1.5
Helps plan	123	18.7
Helps give information to parents	1	.2
Other		
Negative	38	5.9
Positive	38	5.9
No Response	247	37.6

TABLE 14

TEACHERS' REPORT:
METHODS OF KEEPING TRACK OF CHILD'S PROGRESS

Methods	Frequency	Percent
Observation	760	98.3
Notetaking	652	84.3
Assessment Instruments	714	92.4
Reviewing Samples of Child's Work	670	86.7
Talking with parents	747	96.7
Talking with other teachers and aides	697	90.2

Note. Categories are not mutually exclusive

TABLE 15

TEACHERS' REPORT:
ASSESSMENT METHOD MOST HELPFUL IN PLANNING
FOR INDIVIDUAL CHILDREN

Method	Frequency	Percent
Observation	331	42.70
Notetaking	29	3.80
Assessment Instruments	146	18.90
Samples of child's work	12	1.60
Talking with parents	19	2.50
Talking with teachers and aides	10	1.30
Team meetings	2	.03
Consultants	5	.06
Combination of methods	124	16.00
Other	5	.06
No response	90	11.60

- Instruments too complicated to use (12)
- Know child's needs without assessment instruments (10)
- Don't know which instruments to use (10)
- Other information more important (8)
- Administrative decision not to use instrument (7)
- Don't know how to use them (6)
- Not suitable to child's culture and language (4)
- Don't have time (4)

Three percent of the responding teachers have formerly used assessment instruments, but have discontinued their use.

The listing of discontinued instruments and the reasons for discontinuing are widely scattered, with frequencies of seven or less on each item.

Do Directors and Teachers Think the Assessment Instruments They Know About or Use Are Appropriate to the Culture and Language of the Children in the Program?

Ninety-eight percent of the teachers and 98% of the directors responding think the assessment instruments they use are appropriate to the culture and language of the children. Only 1% of the teachers and less than 1% of the directors think the instruments are not at all appropriate.

What Assessment Instruments Do Teachers Use?

Information was sought on individual assessment instruments through a separate form inserted in the teacher questionnaires. Teachers filled out one form for each instrument (Appendix F). If the instrument was developed by teachers, specialists, or other local personnel, teachers were asked to send a copy for the investigator's files. The information, then, is presented in terms of instruments reported. Additional information on this question was collected through the director questionnaire, but has not yet been analyzed.

Instruments reported are of an amazing variety. One hundred seventy-eight individual titles were coded. Teachers were required to write in the name of the instrument, and the deciphering of the fragments of titles, abbreviations, identification by author or trainer, and other incomplete information became something of a puzzle. There was confusion as to whether the instrument was published or locally developed. The Learning Accomplishment Profile, Denver Developmental Screening Test, and other published instruments are sometimes reported as locally developed instruments.

Teachers identify 43.4% of the instruments as being locally developed. Staff coding lessened this percentage to 35%. However, some of the check lists, progress reports, and "Head Start" titles may, upon further analysis, be identified as local instruments. Instruments with Head Start in the title were coded under Head

Start and the topic. Many of the local instruments appear to be modeled after, or are portions and combinations of published instruments.

Table 16 displays the most frequently used assessment instruments, as reported by the teachers.

The two most frequently used published instruments are the Learning Accomplishment Profile or LAP (10.5%) and the Denver Developmental Screening Test or DDST (8.4%). The percentage then drops to slightly over 3% for both the Portage Guide and "check lists," some of which are local.

Use of the instruments is required in 74% of the cases. When use of an instrument is required the requirement is set by

- Directors in 47.5% of the cases
- Education Coordinators in 35.3% of the cases
- Others (handicapped coordinator, psychologist, and so forth) in 17.2% of the cases.

What Is Assessed?

Forty percent of the instruments are reported to assess only one or more of the basic developmental areas: physical, social-emotional and intellectual.

- Physical development is assessed by 81.5% of the instruments
- Social-emotional development is assessed by 78.2% of the instruments
- Intellectual development is assessed by 87.8% of the instruments.

TABLE 16

MOST FREQUENTLY USED ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

Name	Frequency	Percent
Locally-Developed Instruments	535	35.0
Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP)	161	10.5
Denver Developmental Screening Test (DDST)	129	8.4
Checklists	54	3.5
Portage Guide to Early Education	49	3.2
Cooperative Preschool Inventory (Caldwell)	44	2.9
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT)	33	2.2
Child Assessment Form (OCD)	32	2.1
Santa Clara Inventory of Development (IOD)	28	1.8
School Before Six	23	1.5
Developmental Profile (Alpern-Boll)	20	1.3
Growth Inventory (Head Start)	19	1.2
Test of Basic Concepts (Boehm)	18	1.2
All Others	382	25.2

Sixty percent of the instruments assess other areas as well, with 30% assessing one additional area, 14% two additional areas, and 16% three or more additional areas.

Based on the total pool of possible responses to "What else does this assessment instrument tell you about the child," the following categories were compiled:

Categories	Percent of Times Specified
Language	7.6%
Physical	7.4%
Social-Emotional	6.2%
Cognitive	3.5%
Other	3.4%
Total Child	2.7%
Perceptual	2.5%
Cultural and Family Background	1.4%

Within these large categories, the following subgroups show a sizeable response

Self-Help	3.0%
Fine-Motor	2.2%
Health	1.6%
Speech/expressive language	1.6%
Gross-Motor	1.5%
Handicap detection	.7%

What Are the Patterns of Use of the Individual Assessment Instruments?

The mean number of children assessed by an individual instrument is 22. Some teachers responded for 2 classes, some for team teaching, some for whole centers, thus making the mean larger than the mean class size, which is 19.2.

The frequency and pattern of use of the individual assessment instrument are presented in Table 17.

Sixteen percent of the instruments receive moderate use, every two or three months. Twenty-three percent receive frequent use, daily through monthly. However, almost half of the instruments are used either once or twice a year, with twice a year being the most frequently reported use.

The time required for administration of the individual assessment instruments is reported in Table 18. Over 60% of the instruments require 30 minutes or less to administer. Sixteen percent report "other" times, and specify "ongoing" or "as needed."

Thirty-one percent of the teachers receive assistance in administering the assessment instruments. When they receive assistance, 74% are helped by people who have no professional training, such as aides (48%), parents (28%), and students (.8%). Eighteen percent receive assistance from the director, and 9% from specialists.

A different pattern emerges when assistance is required for interpretation of results. Only 18% receive any assistance in interpretation, but 85% of that comes from specialists. Only 6% comes from aides and 9% from the director.

TABLE 17

FREQUENCY AND PATTERN OF USE OF
ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

Time Interval	Frequency	Percent
Daily	167	10.9
Weekly	74	4.8
Every two weeks	31	2.0
Monthly	84	5.5
Every two months	39	2.6
Every three months	212	13.9
Twice a year	526	34.4
Once a year	215	14.1
Other	145	9.5
No response	34	2.3

Mode - Twice a year.

TABLE 18

TIME REQUIRED FOR ADMINISTRATION OF
ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

Length of Time	Frequency	Percent
Brief	461	30.2
5 minutes	106	6.9
10 minutes	146	9.6
15 minutes	209	13.7
Moderate	492	32.2
20 minutes	261	17.1
30 minutes	231	15.1
Long	258	16.9
45 minutes	90	6.4
1 hour	102	6.7
1.5 hours	58	3.8
Other	250	16.4
No Response	66	4.3

What Are Teacher Perceptions of the Utility of Assessment Instruments?

Teacher reports of the value and utility of the individual assessment instruments they use are overwhelmingly positive. Ninety-seven percent say the instruments are of value in planning. Less than 1% find them to be of no value in planning; only 2.2% find them to be of little value in planning. The ways they use the information are reported in Table 19. Only 3% say they do not use the information much.

The most important use of information from individual assessment instruments is shown in Table 20. To learn about the child and to plan are by far the most important uses.

Are There Developmental Areas That Are Particularly Important to Assess?

Ninety percent of the directors thought that there are areas of the child's development that are particularly important to assess and evaluate.

The areas they list as most important are shown in Table 21.

Is There A Perceived Need for Additional Assessment Instruments?

Teachers' and directors' perceptions of the need for additional instruments are quite similar. They respond "No," almost 2 to 1, with slightly more (3.5%) teachers than directors responding "No."

TABLE 19

WAYS INFORMATION FROM INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS IS USED BY TEACHERS

Use of Information	Frequency	Percent
To plan for child	1289	84.4
To learn about child's needs	1383	90.6
To refer child for special help	1174	76.9
To keep records	1138	74.5

Note. Categories are not mutually exclusive.

TABLE 20

MOST IMPORTANT USE OF INFORMATION FROM INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

Use of Information	Frequency	Percent
To refer the child	75	4.9
To learn about the child	487	31.9
To find the child's needs	37	2.4
To find the child's strengths	2	0.1
To check the child's progress	33	2.2
To plan	339	22.2
To keep records	45	2.9
To pass on information to parents	26	1.7
Other		
Positive	114	7.6
Negative	6	.6
No Response	359	23.5

TABLE 21

DIRECTORS' REPORT: AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT IMPORTANT TO ASSESS

Developmental Area	Frequency	Percent
Total Child	46	2.3
Physical	455	23.1
Social-Emotional	412	20.9
Cognitive	242	12.3
Language	220	11.2
Perception	46	2.3
Culture/Family Background	14	.2
Other	21	1.1
No Response	515	26.1

	Need More Instruments	Do Not Need More Instruments	No Response
Directors	39.3%	58.6%	2.3%
Teachers	35.3%	61.4%	3.2%

Thirty-five percent of the teachers perceive a need for additional instruments. They were asked to specify what developmental areas these instruments should assess. Less than 25% of the opportunities to respond were used. The few patterns that emerge are shown below. Other responses are widely varied.

- Social-emotional development, including self-concept is specified 162 times, or 7%
- Self-concept is specified separately 57 times, or 2.5%
- Physical development is specified 97times, or 4.2%
- Language development is specified 77 times, or 3.3%

Eighty-seven percent of the teachers think teachers should have a role in the development of assessment instruments, and 79% of them make specific suggestions. However, these responses are quite varied and no consistent pattern emerges.

Thirty-nine percent of the directors perceive a need for more instruments. Eighteen percent of the opportunities to specify in which areas these should be developed were used. These responses are shown below:

- Social-emotional development, including self-concept, is specified 124 times, or 6.2%

- Physical development is specified 52 times, or 2.6%
- Language development is specified 80 times or 4.1%
- Cognitive development is specified 42 times or 2.1%
- Another kind of instrument is specified 43 times or 2.1%

What Role Do Parents Play in the Assessment Process?

Parents are involved in the assessment process in several ways. Ninety-five percent of the responding directors identify "talking with parents" as an assessment procedure used by teachers in the program. Ninety-seven percent of the responding teachers report "talking with parents" as an assessment procedure. Only observation as an assessment procedure is checked more frequently by either directors or teachers.

However, only two percent of the directors identify "talking with parents" as being the most useful one for learning what a child knows and can do. Less than two percent of the teachers identify "talking with parents" as the assessment procedure most useful for planning.

Sixty-five percent of the teachers responding say that parents help in the classroom program. However, in reporting on the administration of an individual assessment instrument, of the thirty percent of the instruments that require help in administration, parents are involved in the administration in only twenty-five percent of the cases.

In reporting on individual assessment instruments, teachers are given an opportunity to specify how they use the information from the instrument. Several typical classroom-related uses were listed, and then a section for "other." Response to the open question was low (13%), but 32% (sixty-two teachers) of those that responded, wrote that they used the information in working with or reporting to parents.

Locally developed instruments were reviewed to determine if parents were involved, as well as the nature of the involvement. Since locally developed instruments constitutes the largest category used by Head Start programs (798 total), the information should give some indication of local programs' perceptions of the role of parents in the assessment process. Appendix J contains a full report of the analysis of local instruments. Only the parental role is reported here.

Locally developed instruments were reviewed to determine

- Are parents involved in assessment?
- What is the nature of the involvement?
- What is the type of instrument?

Information about parents' roles was collected in answering all these questions. The first two questions were considered together, and will be discussed first.

Thirteen percent, 104 of the 798 instruments reviewed, clearly involved parents in some way. In these 104 instruments, parents provided information about the child's development in 47% of the cases, were the principal assessors in 38%, and had information from the assessment reported to them in 46% of the cases.

Another type of analysis of local instruments was done, to determine the characteristics or "type" of instrument. Information about the parental role was also gathered in this analysis of 471 instruments for "type."

Table 22 displays this information, excerpted from other tables to point up parental involvement.

TABLE 22

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN LOCALLY DEVELOPED ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

Categories/Answer	Frequency	Percent of Instruments Reviewed
Parents report information	34	7.0%
Parents assess/evaluate	26	5.5%
Family background/history is recorded	10	2.0%
Family knowledge of their child's development	34	7.2%
Family involvement in center/ classroom	8	1.7%
Instrument used to learn about child's home environment	5	1.0%
Information from instrument used to report to parents	16	3.4%
Information from instrument used to plan for parental involvement in school	1	.2%
Parent and child are observed	5	1.0%
Parent is observed	3	.6%
Parent answers questions	31	7.0%

Note. Data obtained from 471 instruments

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abeson, A., Bolick, N., & Hass, J. A primer on due process: Education decisions for handicapped children. Reston, Va: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1975.

Almy, M. The early childhood educator at work. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1975.

Almy, M. Ways of studying children: A manual for teachers. New York: Columbia University, 1959.

American Personnel and Guidance Association. In T. Oakland, (Ed.), Non-biased assessment of minority group children: With bias toward none. Lexington, Ky.: Coordinating Office for Regional Resource Centers, University of Kentucky, 1976, p. 15.

American Psychological Association, Inc., Standards for educational and psychological tests. Washington, D.C.: author, 1974.

Anastasi, A. Culture-fair testing. In G. H. Bracht, K.D. Hopkins, and J.C. Stanley (Eds.), Perspectives in educational and psychological measurement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Anderson, S.B. Testing from six to eight years. In K. Ingerkamp (Ed.), Developments in educational testing. New York: Gordon & Breach, 1968.

Anderson, S. & Messick, S. Social competency in young children. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10 (2), 282-293.

Anderson, S., Messick, S., & Hartshorne, N. Priorities and directions for research and development related to measurement of young children: Report on Task 2. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 088 927).

Announcement of the diagnostic criteria for reporting handicapped children in Head Start. (OCD Notice A-30-333-4). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1975.

Association of Black Psychologists position statement. Adapted at a meeting of the Association in Washington, D.C., 1969. In T. Oakland, (Ed.), Non-biased assessment of minority group children: With bias toward none. Lexington, Ky.: Coordinating Office for Regional Resource Centers, University of Kentucky, 1976.

Association of Psychologists of La Raza. In T. Oakland, (Ed.), Non-biased assessment of minority group children: With bias toward none. Lexington, Ky.: Coordinating Office for Regional Resource Centers, University of Kentucky, 1976.

Barclay, J. Controversial issues in testing. Guidance Monograph Series III: Testing. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968.

Bates, B. (Ed.). Research, demonstration, and evaluation studies: Fiscal year 1974 (DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 75-30). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1974.

Becoming a Child Development Associate: A guide for trainees. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1975.

Bernal, E. M., Jr. Perspectives on nondiscriminatory assessment. In T. Oakland (Ed.), Non-biased assessment of minority group children: With bias toward none. Lexington, Ky.: Coordinating Office for Regional Resource Centers, University of Kentucky, 1976.

Bissell, J.S. Implementation of Planned Variation in Head Start. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1971.

Block, N.J., & Dworkin, G. (Eds.). The IQ Controversy. New York: Pantheon Books, 1976.

Bloom, B.S., Hastings, J.T., Mandaus, G.F. Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1971.

Boger, R.P. & Knight, S.S. Social-emotional task force: Final report. Grand Rapids: Michigan State University Head Start Evaluation and Research Center, 1969.

Bradley, R.H. & Caldwell, B.M. Issues and procedures in testing young children. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 102 208).

Brandt, R.M. Studying behavior in natural settings. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1972.

Brazziel, W.F. Two years of Head Start. In J. L. Frost (Ed.), Early childhood education rediscovered. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1968.

Brim, O., Glass, D., Neulinger, J., & Firestone, I. American beliefs and attitudes about intelligence. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Broman, S.H. Preschool IQ: Prenatal and early development correlates. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1975.

Bronfenbrenner, U. A report on longitudinal evaluations of preschool programs: Vol. II: Is early intervention effective? (DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 76-30025). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1974.

Brophy, J.E., Good, T., & Nedler, S.E. Teaching in the preschool. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka. 347 U.S. (1954).

Buros, O.K. (Ed.). The seventh mental measurements yearbook (2 vols.). Highland Park, N.J.: The Gryphon Press, 1972.

Bussis, A.M., Chittenden, E.A., & Amarel, M. Alternative ways in educational evaluation. In M.D. Cohen (Ed.), Testing and evaluation: New views. Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International, 1975.

Caldwell, B.M. The importance of beginning early. In J. Jordan & R. Dailey (Eds.), Not all little wagons are red. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1972.

Career development manual. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1973.

Cartwright, C.A. & Cartwright, G.P. Developing observation skills. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Carver, R.P. Special problems in measuring change with psychometric devices. In Evaluation research strategies and methods. Pittsburgh: American Institute for Research, 1970.

Cattell, P. The measurement of intelligence of infants and young children. (Rev. ed.). New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1960.

Cazden, C.B. The neglected situation in child language research and education. In F. Williams (Ed.), Language and poverty: Perspectives on a theme. Chicago: Markham, 1971

Cazden, C.B. Child language and education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Chase, C.I. Classroom testing and the right to privacy. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 58, (4), 331-332.

CDA credential recognized. Dateline CDA, 1976, 3 (1), 3.

Child Development Associate training guide (DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 75-1065). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1973.

Cicirelli, V., et. al. The impact of Headstart. An evaluation of the effects of Headstart on children's cognitive and affective development. Report to the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity by Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Ohio University, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

Civil Rights Act, Sections 601 and 602; 78 Stat. 252; 42 U.S. Code Z000d, Z000d-1, 1964.

Clark, V.L. What are the essential characteristics of the effective early education programs? Paper presented at the Spring Research Conference of the North Carolina Association of Research in Education, Reidsville, N.C., 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 110 197).

Cohen, D., & Stern, V. Observing and recording the behavior of young children. New York: Teachers College Press, 1975.

Cohen, S. Integrating children with handicaps into early childhood education programs. Children Today, 1975, 4, (1), 15-17.

Colvin, R., & Zaffiro, E. (Eds.). Preschool education: Handbook for the training of early childhood educators. New York: Springer Publishing Company, 1974.

Combs, A.W. Educational accountability: Beyond behavioral objectives. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972.

Community Health Foundation. Head Start and early and periodic screening, diagnosis and treatment: Recipes for success. (DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 76-31097). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Crombag, H.F. & DeGruijter, D.N. (Eds.). Contemporary issues in educational testing. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton & Company, 1974.

Cronbach, L.J. Essentials of psychological testing. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Datta, L. A report on evaluation studies of Project Head Start. Paper presented at the 1969 American Psychological Association Convention. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1969.

Datta, L., McHale, C., & Mitchell, S. The effects of the Head Start classroom experience on some aspects of child development: A summary report of national evaluations, 1966-1969. (DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 76-30088). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, No date.

Davis, F.B. Criterion referenced measurement (TM Report 17). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

DeAvila, E.A. & Duncan, S.E. A few thoughts about language assessment: The Lau decision reconsidered. Paper prepared for the Conference on Research and Policy Implications of the Task Force Report of the U.S. Office of Civil Rights, 1976.

DeAvila, E.A. & Havassy, B.E. Piagetian alternatives to IQ: Mexican American Study. In N. Hobbs (Ed.), Issues in the classification of children, Vol. II. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Development Associates, Inc. Report of the Task Force on Handicap Services. San Francisco, Ca.: author, 1976.

Diana v. California State Board of Education. Civ. No. C-7037 RFR, (N.D. Cal., Filed January, 1970).

Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation. A review of research: Implications for the Head Strat handicapped effort. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, 1974, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 108 442).

Divoky, D. The grand illusion. Learning. March 1977, 28-34

Donlon, T. F. Some needs for clearer terminology in criterion referenced testing. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1974

Dyer, H.S. Recycling the problems in testing. In Assessment in a pluralistic society: Proceedings of the 1972 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973, p. 86.

Dyer, H. S. Testing little children: Some old problems in new settings. Childhood Education. 1973, 49 (7), 362-367

Dyer, H. S. The discovery and development of educational goals. In G. H. Bracht, K. D. Hopkins & J. C. Stanley (Eds.), Perspectives in educational and psychological measurement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972

Dyer, H. S. Needed changes to sweeten the impact of testing. In G. H. Bracht, K. D. Hopkins, & J. C. Stanley (Eds.), Perspectives in educational and psychological measurement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972

Dyer, H. S. Testing little children: Some old problems in new settings. Paper presented at the National Leadership Institute in Early Childhood Education, Washington, D.C., 1971 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 057 112).

Ebel, R. L. Must all test be valid? In G. H. Bracht, K. D. Hopkins, & J. C. Stanley (Eds.), Perspectives in educational and psychological measurement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Ebel, R. L. The relation of tests to educational objectives. In K. Ingenkamp (Ed.), Developments in educational testing. New York: Gordon & Breach, 1968.

Ebel, R. L. The social consequences of educational testing. In G. H. Bracht, K. D. Hopkins, & J. C. Stanley (Eds.), Perspectives in educational and psychological measurement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1972.

Ebel, R. L. Using tests to improve instruction. In K. Ingenkamp (Ed.), Developments in educational testing. New York: Gordon & Breach, 1968.

Education Law Center, Inc. Due process and the exceptional child: A guide for parents. Philadelphia, Pa.: author, 1976.

Einsher, G., Blatt, B., & Winschell, J. Head Start for the handicapped: Congressional mandate audit. Exceptional Children, 1977, 43 (4), 202-210.

Escalona, S. Background papers of the Boston conference, Screening and Assessment of Young Children at Developmental Risk, 1972.

Evans, E. D. Measurement practices in early childhood education. In R. W. Colvin & E. M. Zaffiro (Eds.) Preschool education: A handbook for the training of early childhood educators. New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1974.

Evans, J. Survey of tests administered to preschool children in Texas. Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1973.

Exceptional Children, 1976 43 (3).

Frankenburg, W. K., et. al. Training the indigenous nonprofessional: The screening technician. The Journal of Pediatrics, 1970, 77 (4), 564-570.

Frankenburg, W. K. & Camp, B. W. (Eds.). Pediatric screening tests. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1975.

Frankenburg, W.K. & Goldstein, A.D. Procedure for selecting screening technicians. Denver: University of Colorado Medical Center Department of Pediatrics. No date.

Gesell, A. Child development: An introduction to the study of human growth. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Gesell, A. The first five years of life. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940.

Glaser, R. & Nilko, A.J. Measurement in learning and instruction. In R. L. Thorndike, (Ed.), Educational Measurement (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971, pp. 625-70.

Glass, G.V. Comments on Professor Bloom's paper. In M.C. Wittrock & D.E. Wiley (Eds.), The evaluation of instruction: Issues and problems. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1970.

Glassman, L. Utilizing resources in the handicapped services field: A directory for Head Start personnel. Reston, Va: Council for Exceptional Children, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 091-883).

Goldberg, M. L. Adapting teacher style to pupil differences: Teachers for disadvantaged children. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10 (2), 161-177.

Goldman, L. Tests should make a difference. In G. H. Bracht, K. D. Hopkins, & J. C. Stanley (Eds.), Perspectives in educational and psychological measurement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1972

Goodlad, J. I., Klein, M. F., & Novotney, J. M. Early schooling in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973

Goodwin, W. L. Evaluation in early childhood education. In R. W. Colvin & E. M. Zaffiro (Eds.) Preschool education: A handbook for the training of early childhood educators. New York: Springer Publishing Company, 1974

Gordon, I. Studying the child in the school. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Goslin, D.A. Teachers and testing. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Gotts, E.E. & Pierce-Jones, J. Evaluating Head Start inputs and outcomes. In J. L. Frost (Ed.), Early childhood education rediscovered: Readings. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1968.

Grassi, J.A., Pinkstaff, D., Henley C., Sanford, A.R. The Chapel Hill study of the impact of mainstreaming handicapped children in Region IV Head Start. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Chapel Hill Training Project, 1975.

Grotberg, E.H. Review of research 1965-1969. Washington, D.C.: Project Head Start, U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, 1969.

Harris, C.W., Alkin, M.C., & Popham, W.J. (Eds.). Problems in criterion-referenced measurements. In M.C. Alkin (Ed.), CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation (No. 3). Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation, 1974.

Hawthorne, P. Characteristics of and proposed models for state accountability legislation. State Education Accountability Repository, 1974.

Head Start program performance standards. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1975.

Head Start program performance standards self-assessment/validation Instrument. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Office of Child Development, 1976.

Head Start services to handicapped children: First annual report. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1973.

Head Start services to handicapped children: Second annual report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Deparment of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1974.

Head Start services to handicapped children: Third annual report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1975.

Hein, G. E. Standardized testing: Reform is not enough! In V. Perrone (Coordinator), Testing and evaluation: New views. Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhoood Education International, 1975.

Heironymus, A.N. Today's testing: What do we know how to do? In Proceedings of the 1971 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service. 1971.

Hobbs, N. (Ed.). Issues in the classification of children (2 vols.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Hobson v. Hanson. 269 F. Supp. 401 (1967).

Hoepfner, R., Stern, C., & Nummedal, S. G. (Eds.). CSE-ECRC preschool/ kindergarten test evaluations. UCLA Graduate School of Education: Center for the Study of Evaluation & the Early Childhood Research Center, 1971.

Hunt, J. M. Reflections on a decade of early education. Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 092 244).

Hyman, I. A. The psychologist as a teacher trainer for Head Start. College Park, Maryland: Head Start Regional Resource & Training Center, no date.

Ilg, F. L. & Ames, L.B. School readiness. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Jackson, P. W. Naturalistic studies of school and classrooms. In M. W. Apple, M. J. Subkoviak, & H. S. Lufler, Jr. (Eds.) Educational evaluation: analysis and responsibility. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1974.

Jedrysek, E., Klapper, Z,. Pope, L., & Wortis, J. Psychoeducational evaluation of the preschool child. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1972.

Jensen. A. R. Test bias and construct validity. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 58 (4), 340-346.

Johnson. O. G. Tests and measurements in child development: Handbook II. (2 vols.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Johnson, O. G. & Bommarito, J. W. Tests and measurements in child development: Handbook I. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1971.

Jordan, J., Collins, R., & Randolph, L. OCD urges special education's support for new Head Start services to handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1973, 40 (1), 45-48.

Judge Baker Guidance Center. Head Start assessment materials. Boston, Mass.: author, no date.

Judge Baker Guidance Center. Responding to individual needs in Head Start, Part I: Working with the individual child. (DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 76-31075) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1974.

Kamii, C. K. Evaluation of learning in preschool education. In B. S. Bloom, J. T. Hastings, & G. F. Madaus. Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971

Keogh, B. & Becker, L. Early detection of learning problems: Questions, cautions and guidelines. Exceptional Children, 1973, 40 (1), 5-11.

Keogh, B. & Smith, C. Early identification of educationally high potential and high risk children. Journal of School Psychology, 1970, 8 (4), 285-290.

Kierscht, M. S. & Vietze, P. M. Test stiumli: Representational level with middle class and Head Start children. Psychology in the Schools, 1975, 12 (3), 309-312. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 118 256).

Kirk, S. A. The educability of intelligence: Start with young children. In J. Jordan & R. Dailey (Eds.) Not all little wagons are red. Reston, Va: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1972.

Klein, J. W. Mainstreaming the preschooler. Young Children, 1975, 30 (5), 317-326.

Klein, J. & Randolph, L. Placing handicapped children in Head Start programs. Children Today, Nov.-Dec. 1974, 7-10.

Klein, S. P. & Kosecoff, J. Issues and procedures in the development of criterion referenced tests (TM Report 26). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Kurfeerst, M. & Stephens, T.M. The national evaluation of Project Follow Through: 1967-1968. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh School of Education Office of Research and Field Services, 1969. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 078 923).

Laosa, L. M. Bilingualism in three United States Hispanic groups: Contextual use of language by children and adults in their families. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67 (5), 617-627.

Laosa, L. M. Historical antecedents and current issues in non-discriminatory assessment of children's abilities. In T. Oakland (Ed.), Non-biased assessment of minority group children: With bias toward none. Lexington, Ky.: Coordinating Office for Regional Resource Centers, University of Kentucky, 1976.

Lebanks v. Spears, 60 FRD 135 (E.D. LA.1973).

Levenson, D. Where do they belong? Teacher, 1977, 94 (7), 54-56.

Levine, M. The academic achievement test: Its historical context and social function. American Psychologist, 1976, 31 (3), 228-238.

Mackler, B. & Holman, D. Assessing, packaging, and delivery: Tests, testing, and race. Young Children, 1976, 31 (5), 351-363.

Maitland, S., Nadeau, J. and Nadeau, G. Early school screening practices. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 7 (10), Dec., 1974, p. 55-59.

Mann, A.J., Harrell, A., & Hurt, M. Jr. A review of Head Start research since 1969: A working draft. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University Social Research Group, 1976.

McClelland, D.C. Testing for competence rather than for intelligence. In N.J. Block and G. Dworkin, (Eds.), The IQ Controversy: Critical readings. New York: Pantheon Books, 1976.

McKenna, B.H. A tale of testing in two cities. National Elementary Principal, 1975, 54 (6), 40-45.

Mehrens, W.A. & Lehmann, I.J. Measurement and evaluation in education and psychology. United States: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.

Meier, J. Screening and assessment of young children at developmental risk. (DHEW Publication No.(os) 73-90). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Mendelson, A., & Atlas, R. Early childhood assessment: Paper and pencil for whom? Childhood Education, 1973, 49 (7), 357-361.

Mercer, J. R. A policy statement on assessment procedures and the rights of children. Harvard Educational Review, 1974, 44 (1), 125-141.

Messick, S. The role of values in evaluation. In H. Crombag & D.N. DeGruijter (Eds.), Contemporary issues in educational testing. The Haque, Netherlands: Mouton & Company, 1974.

Messick. S. & Anderson, S. Educational testing, individual development and social responsibility. In R. W. Tyler & R. M. Wolf (Eds.), Crucial issues in testing. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutcheon Publishing Company, 1974.

Meyers, E. J., Ball, H. H., Crutchfield, M. The kindergarten teacher's handbook. Los Angeles: Granmercy Press, 1973.

Mills vs. Board of Education. 348 F. Supp. 866 (D.D.C. 1972).

Moustakas, C., Sigel, I., & Schalock, H. An objective method for the measurement and analysis of child-adult interaction. Child Development, 1956, 27 109-134.

Murphy, L. B. The stranglehold of norms on the individual child. Childhood Education, 1973, 49 (7), 343-349.

National Education Association. Report of the NEA task force on testing. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1973.

National Society for the Study of Education. The seventy-first yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II: Early childhood education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Nazzaro. J. Head Start for the handicapped: What's been accomplished? Exceptional Children, 1974, 41 (2), 103-106.

Nomland, E. K. Evaluating ourselves in Head Start. Washington, D.C.: ERIC, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 109 141)

Oakland, T. (Ed.) Non-biased assessment of minority group children: With bias toward none. Lexington, Ky.: Coordinating Office for Regional Resource Centers, Univeristy of Kentucky, 1976.

Omwake, E. Head Start -- measurable and immeasurable. In J. Hellmuth (Ed.), Disadvantaged child (Vol. 2). New York: Brunner/ Mazel, Inc., 1968.

Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire design and attitude measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

Patton, M. Q. Understanding the gobble-dy-gook. In M. D. Cohen (Ed.) Testing and evaluation: New Views. Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International, 1975.

Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children vs. Pennsylvania. 343 F. Supp. 279 (E.D. PA 1972).

Performance Management Specialists. Manual of procedures for Project Head Start assessment/evaluation: OCD Region VIII. Englewood, Co.: author, no date.

Perrone, V. An ACEI/NAESP position paper. Childhood Education, 1976, 53 (1), 9-15.

Popham, W. and Husek, T.R., Implications of criterion-referenced measurements, Journal of Educational Measurement, 1969, 6 (1). 1-9.

Prince, D. (Ed.) Tool Kit 76. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1976.

The Psychological Corporation. On telling parents about test results. New York: author, 1959.

Pumroy, D. K. Assessment of specific behaviors of preschool children. College Park: University of Maryland Head Start Regional Resource & Training Center, no date.

Rackley, R. (Ed.) Research, demonstration, and evaluation studies: Fiscal year 1976. (DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 76-30030). Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1976.

The Rand Corporation. Plan for an evaluation of social competence in Head Start children: Preliminary draft. Washington, D.C.: author, 1974.

Raskin, L., Taylor, W., & Kerckoff, F. The teacher as observer for assessment: A guideline. Young Children, 1975, 30 (5), 339-344.

Ricks, J. H. Jr. Local norms -- when and why. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1971.

Rosner, B. Teacher perceptions of their test needs. In K. Ingenkamp (Ed.), Developments in educational testing. New York: Gordon & Breach, 1968.

Ryan, S. (Ed.) A report on longitudinal evaluations of preschool programs: Vol. I: Longitudinal evaluations. (DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 76-30024). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1974.

Samuda, R. J. Psychological testing of American minorities: Issues and consequences. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Company, 1975.

Sanford, A., Pinkstaff, D., et al. The 1976 Chapel Hill Study of services to the handicapped in Region IV Head Start. Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1976.

Scriven, M. The methodology of evaluation. AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1967, 1.

Selected readings in early education of handicapped children. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children Head Start Information Project, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 091 884)

Sigel, I. E. Developmental theory: Its place and relevance in early intervention programs. Young Children, 1972, 27 (6), 364-372.

Sigel, I. E. The search for validity or the evaluator's nightmare. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1975.

Sigel, I. E. When do we know what a child knows? Human Development, 1974, 17 201-217.

Silberman, A. Tests--Are they fair to your child? Woman's Day, November, 1976, pp. 54-62.

Silverman, R. J., Noa, J. D., & Russell, R. H. Oral language tests for bilingual students: An evaluation of language dominance and proficiency instruments. Portand, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1976.

Simon, J. L. & McArdle, P. A self-instructional module for EPSDT: Marketing EPSDT to clients. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

Smith, C.W. Criterion referenced assessment. In H. Crombag & D. N. DeGruijter (Eds.), Contemporary issues in educational testing. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton and Company, 1974.

Spodek, B. Staff requirements in early childhood education. In T. Gordon (Ed.). Early childhood education: The seventy-first yearbook of the national society for the study of education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Stodolsky, S. S. What tests do and don't do. In M. Cohen (Ed.), Testing and evaluation: New Views. Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International, 1975.

Stone, J. S. & Janis, M. G. Daily program I for a child development center: An overview. (DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 73-1016). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Syracuse University Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation. A review of research: Implications for the Head Start handicapped effort. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 108 442).

Texas day care study, final report: Occupational analysis of day care personnel. San Antonio: University of Texas, 1975.

Tractenberg, P. L. & Jacoby, E. Pupil testing: A legal view: Report No. 38. Princeton, N.J.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement and Evaluation, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 102 211)

Travis, C. Compensatory education: The glass is half-full. Psychology Today, September, 1976, 10, (4), 63-74.

Tyler, R.W. The purposes of assessment. In W. H. Beatty (Ed.), Improving educational assessment and an inventory of measures of affective behavior. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969.

Tyler, R. W. Introduction. In Educational evaluation: New roles, new means, sixty-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Tyler, R. W. and Wolf, R.M. Crucial issues in testing. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.

United States Code: 1970 edition (Vol. 5). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

United States Code: 1970 edition (Vol. 9). Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

U. S. Department of HEW Social and Rehabilitation Service/The American Medical Association Committee on Health Care of the Poor. A report on professional health provider participation: EPSDT-Medicaid. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1974.

Van Sikle, R. L. Measurement issues and competency-based teacher certification. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 118 560)

Vindication for Vincent. Newsweek, January 10, 1977, p. 44.

Walker, D. K. Socioemotional measures for preschool and kindergarten children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Walker, J. E. & Shea, T. M. A national survey: Certification of preschool teachers. 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 116 823)

Washington Research Project and NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. Is it helping poor children? (Rev. ed.) Author, 1973.

Webster, M. The quest for better schools: Statewide testing legislation and educational policy. Syracuse, N.Y.: Educational Policy Research Center, 1973.

Weinberg, R. A. & Moore, S. G. (Eds.). Evaluation of educational programming for young children: The Minnesota Roundtable in Early Childhood Education II. Washington, D.C.: Child Devleopment Associates Consortium, 1975.

White, Sheldon et al. Federal programs for young children: Review and recommendations. (4 vols.) (DHEW Publication No. (OS) 74-101, 74-102, 74-103, 74-104). Washington,D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Wijnen, W. H. Formative evaluation and educational practice. In H. Crombag & D. N. DeGruijter (Eds.), Contemporary issues in educational testing. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton & Company, 1974.

Williams, R. Abuses and misuse in testing black children. In R. Jones (Ed.), Black Psychology. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Wright, H. F. Observational child study. In P. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of research methods in child development. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1960.

Yawkey, T. D. & Silvern, S. B. Evaluating instructional goals of developmental programs in early childhood education. Education, 1975, 96 (1), 36-39.

Zigler, E. Project Head Start: Success or failure? Children Today, Nov.-Dec. 1973, 2-7.